

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS



LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

VOL. 2

FALL, 1957

NO. 1

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

A RECORD OF CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE
ISSUED BY THE JESUITS OF WESTON COLLEGE, WESTON 93, MASS., U.S.A.

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS is published three times each year (fall, winter, spring). Subscription, payable in advance: \$3.00 annually, postage prepaid. Current single issues are \$1.00, back copies \$1.25, postage prepaid. All remittances (checks and postal money orders) should be made payable to NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS.

Editorial and business correspondence, including notice of change of address, should be addressed to NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS, Weston College, Weston 93, Mass., U.S.A.

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS is published with the permission of ecclesiastical superiors.

BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

In titles of articles and books at the beginning of an abstract references to books of the Bible are given exactly as in the original article or book. But in the abstract itself references to books of the Bible are given in abbreviated form with Arabic numerals throughout, e.g., Mt 2:3, without a period after the abbreviation.

OLD TESTAMENT

Gen	Genesis	Est	Esther	Ezek	Ezekiel
Exod	Exodus	Job	Job	Dan	Daniel
Lev	Leviticus	Ps	Psalms	Hos	Hosea
Num	Numbers	Prov	Proverbs	Joel	Joel
Deut	Deuteronomy	Qoh	Qoheleth	Amos	Amos
Josh	Joshua		(Ecclesiastes)	Obad	Obadiah
Jdg	Judges	Cant	Song of Songs	Jon	Jonah
Ruth	Ruth	Wis	Wisdom of	Mic	Micah
1, 2 Sam	1, 2 Samuel		Solomon	Nah	Nahum
1, 2 Kgs	1, 2 Kings	Sir	Ben Sira	Hab	Habakkuk
1, 2 Chr	1, 2 Chronicles		(Ecclesiasticus)	Zeph	Zephaniah
Ezra	Ezra	Isa	Isaiah	Hag	Haggai
Neh	Nehemiah	Jer	Jeremiah	Zech	Zechariah
Tob	Tobit	Lam	Lamentations	Mal	Malachi
Jth	Judith	Bar	Baruch	1, 2 Mac	1, 2 Mac-
					cabees

NEW TESTAMENT

Mt	Matthew	Gal	Galatians	Phlm	Philemon
Mk	Mark	Eph	Ephesians	Heb	Hebrews
Lk	Luke	Phil	Philippians	Jas	James
Jn	John	Col	Colossians	1, 2 Pt	1, 2 Peter
Acts	Acts	1, 2 Thes	1, 2 Thessalonians	1, 2, 3 Jn	1, 2, 3 John
Rom	Romans	1, 2 Tim	1, 2 Timothy	Jude	Jude
1, 2 Cor	1, 2 Corinthians	Tit	Titus	Apoc	Apocalypse
				(Rev)	

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS



VOLUME TWO

1957-1958

WESTON COLLEGE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
WESTON 93, MASSACHUSETTS

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

A RECORD OF CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ISSUED BY THE JESUITS OF WESTON COLLEGE, WESTON 93, MASS., U.S.A.

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS is published three times each year (fall, winter, spring), with the permission of ecclesiastical superiors. Subscription, payable in advance: \$3.00 annually, postage prepaid. Current single issues, \$1.00; back copies, \$1.25. All remittances (checks and postal money orders) should be made payable to NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS. Editorial and business correspondence, including notice of change of address, should be addressed to NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS, Weston College, Weston 93, Mass., U.S.A.

Editor

J. J. COLLINS, Prof. New Testament

Associate Editors

B. C. CONNOLLY, Librarian
J. J. WALSH, Prof. Dogmatic Theology

Managing Editor

G. W. MACRAE

Business Manager

F. X. MILLER

Circulation Manager

P. J. GABRIEL

Assistant Editors

J. F. BARRY
J. A. PAQUET

J. F. BRESNAHAN
W. R. PELLETIER

J. B. COLL
J. P. WALSH

Editorial Assistants

N. F. DECKER J. A. DONOHUE M. A. HERNANDEZ W. D. IBACH
P. J. MCKENNA P. J. RYAN L. M. ST. ONGE
J. T. SHEEHAN J. N. TYLEND

Business Staff

J. J. DONOHUE T. J. GIBBONS J. M. MURPHY W. M. SHEA

ABSTRACTORS

Unless otherwise indicated, abstractors are members of Weston College, theologate of the Jesuit Province of New England.

Also contributing to vol. 2 are members of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, and of the Jesuit theologates at Frankfurt-Main, Germany; Los Gatos, Calif.; Louvain, Belgium; Maastricht, Holland; Montreal, Quebec; Pymble, Australia; St. Marys, Kansas; Toronto, Ontario; West Baden, Ind.; and Woodstock, Md.

Ahsmann (PLA) Prof. NT, Maastricht; Austin (JA) Upholland College, England; Bakker (LB) Maastricht; Barry (JFB); Bastian (RJB) West Baden; Bennett (JTB); Beuser (VJB) Los Gatos; Bligh (JFBl) Rome; Blinzler (JBz) Prof. NT, Passau, Germany; Bresnahan (JFBr); Broderick (JFBk) Prof. Ecclesiastical History; Brooks (JEB); Brzoska (ABB) Los Gatos; Buckley (FJB) Los Gatos; Bürck (RB) Prof. SS, Trichinopoly, India; Burns (JAB) West Baden; Bustos

Continued on page iv

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

VOLUME 2

1957-1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

Inspiration, Interpretation, Texts and Versions, NT General	1, 97, 203
Gospels (General)	6, 106, 209
Synoptic Gospels	13, 111, 216
Gospel of St. John	27, 123, 226
Acts of the Apostles	33, 132, 234
Epistles of St. Paul	36, 135, 237
Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse	48, 144, 253
Biblical Theology	51, 145, 254
Early Church, Gnosticism	166, 263
Archaeology	67, 169, 265
Dead Sea Scrolls	69, 172, 266

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

New Testament Aids	181, 286
New Testament Exegesis	77, 182, 271
Gospels	79
Biblical Theology	81, 185, 276
Early Church	88
New Testament Background	88
The World of the New Testament	191
Archaeology	284

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	93, 195, 287
--------------------------	--------------

Book Notices	96, 198, 290
--------------------	--------------

Indexes	299
---------------	-----

SIGLA

The *asterisk* indicates a Catholic author or publication.

The letter *r* indicates a book review abstract.

The contents of abstracts are not necessarily the opinions of the editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS; the views offered on disputed biblical questions remain the opinions of the original authors.

Copyright, 1957-58, by Weston College, Weston, Mass.

ABSTRACTORS (continued)

(FMB) Rome; *Callahan* (ERC) Prof. Dogmatic Theology; *Campbell* (RBC); *Cardoni* (AAC); *Casanovas* (JCs); *Caskin* (JC); *Chênevert* (JPC) Montreal; *Cheney* (RJC); *Clifford* (RJCl); *Collins* (JJC) Prof. NT and Biblical Greek; *Connolly* (BC) Librarian; *Cornellier* (JGC); *Cortés* (JBC); *Creighton* (MEC) West Baden; *Dalton* (WJD) Prof. NT, Pymble; *D'Aragon* (JLD'A) Prof. NT, Montreal; *Decker* (NFD); *de la Potterie* (IdlP) Prof. SS, Louvain; *Donohue* (JJD); *Doyle* (PD) Upholland College, England; *Dufort* (JMD) Montreal; *Dulin* (JTD) West Baden; *Dyson* (RAD) Prof. Exegesis and Biblical Theology, Rome; *Enright* (JJE).

Ferrick (RTF); *Fitzmyer*, S.J. (JAF) American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem; *Foley* (DJF); *Forestell*, C.S.B. (JTF) Prof. SS, St. Basil's Seminary, Toronto; *Fortin* (AF) Montreal; *Garvin* (TRG) Los Gatos; *German* (GGm); *Giblin* (CHG) West Baden; *Gloster* (GFG); *Graystone*, S.M. (GG) Prof. SS and Moral Theology, Paignton, England; *Grispino*, S.M. (JAG) Prof. NT, Marist College, Washington, D. C.; *Gunnes*, O.P. (EG) Oslo; *Hamel* (EH) Montreal; *Harvey*, S.J. (JH) Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore; *Henley* (FMH) West Baden; *Hernandez* (MAH); *Herrero* (JHo); *Huesman* (JEH) Prof. OT, Los Gatos; *Ibach* (WDI); *Isenecker* (LEI) West Baden; *Jarski* (JCJ); *Jenemann* (AHJ); *Johnston* (LJ) Prof. NT, Durham, England; *Jolson* (AJJ); *Kelly* (EFK); *Kelly* (KK) Upholland College, England; *Kemme* (JK) Maastricht; *Kerdiejus* (JBK); *King* (WFK) West Baden; *Koester* (WKs) Prof. NT, Frankfurt-Main; *Krolikowski* (WPK) West Baden; *Kuchler* (WK) Passau, Germany; *Kurris* (FK) Maastricht; *Langevin* (PEL) Montreal; *Laurendeau* (PL) Montreal; *Lynch* (JDL) Montreal; *MacRae* (GWM); *Malo* (JEM); *Martin* (LMM); *Mausolf*, O.F.M.Cap. (IJM) Prof. NT, Marathon, Wis.; *McCool* (FMcC) Prof. NT Exegesis, Rome; *McShane* (JMS) Prof. SS, St. Peter's College, Cardross, Scotland; *Mendoza* (LM); *Meyer* (BFM) Los Gatos; *Miller* (EFM) West Baden; *Monks* (JLM) Prof. Dogmatic Theology and History of Liturgy; *Moriarty* (FLM) Dean, Prof. OT and Hebrew; *Musante* (AJM) Los Gatos; *Musurillo*, S.J. (HMs) Prof. Latin and Greek Lang., Plattsburg, N. Y.

North, S.J. (RN) Dir. Pont. Bib. Inst., Jerusalem; *O'Connor* (JEO'C); *O'Flynn* (JAO'F) Prof. NT, Maynooth, Eire; *O'Keefe* (VO'K) Prof. Fundamental Theology, Woodstock; *O'Rourke* (JO'R) Prof. NT, St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia; *Paré* (AHP); *Philbin* (RGP) Prof. Fundamental Theology; *Powers* (HRP); *Ramallo* (LIR); *Rasco* (EFR) Rome; *Richard* (RLR); *Richer* (MR) Montreal; *Ryan* (PJR); *St. Onge* (LMS); *Sant* (CS) Prof. SS, Seminary, Malta; *Saydon*, Msgr. (PPS) Prof. SS, Greek, and Hebrew, Royal University, Malta; *Schwank*, O.S.B. (BS) Prof. SS, Beuron, Germany; *Sheehan* (JTS); *Shine* (DJS) Prof. Psychology; *Showalter* (JLS) Los Gatos; *Siegman*, C.P.P.S. (EFS) Editor, *CathBibQuart*, Washington, D. C.; *Stanley* (DMS) Prof. NT, Toronto; *StuhlmueLLer*, C.P. (CSt) Prof. OT and Hebrew, Passionist Seminary, Chicago; *Verreault* (FV) Montreal; *Vigneaux* (RV) Montreal; *Walsh* (JPW); *Weber* (CAW) Los Gatos; *Weiser*, S.J. (FXW) Prof. Theology and German Lang., Emmanuel College, Boston; *Weissmahr* (BHW) Maastricht; *Welch* (PCW); *Willmering* (HW) Prof. NT, St. Marys.

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

VOLUME 2

FALL, 1957

NUMBER 1

Editor

J. J. COLLINS

Prof. New Testament

Associate Editors

B. C. CONNOLLY

Librarian

J. J. WALSH

Prof. Dogmatic Theology

Managing Editor

G. W. MACRAE

Business Manager

F. X. MILLER

Assistant Editors

J. F. BARRY

J. B. COLL

J. L. CONNOR

W. T. EGAN

J. W. O'NEIL

J. A. PAQUET

J. P. WALSH

P. C. WELCH

Business Staff

J. J. DONOHUE

T. J. GIBBONS

J. M. MURPHY

W. M. SHEA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Abstractors, Staff	ii

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

Inspiration, Texts, Interpretation, NT	
General	1
Gospels (General)	6
Synoptic Gospels	13
Gospel of St. John	27
Acts of the Apostles	33
Epistles of St. Paul	36
Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse	48
Biblical Theology	51
Archaeology	67
Dead Sea Scrolls	69

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

New Testament Exegesis	77
Gospels	79
Biblical Theology	81
Early Church	87
New Testament Background	88
Books Received	92

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Book Notices	96
Index of Scripture Texts	(1)
Index of Authors	(4)

The contents of abstracts are not necessarily the opinions of the editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS; the views offered on disputed biblical questions remain the opinions of the original authors.

*Copyright, 1957, by Weston College
Weston, Mass.*

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS, STAFF

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS

Unless otherwise indicated, abstractors are members of Weston College, theologate of the Jesuit Province of New England.

Also contributing to this issue are members of the following Jesuit theologates: Frankfurt-Main, Germany; Los Gatos, Calif.; Maastricht, Holland; Montreal, Quebec; St. Marys, Kansas; Toronto, Ontario; West Baden, Ind.; Woodstock, Md.

Ahsmann (PLA) Prof. NT Canisianum, Maastricht, Holland; *Bakker* (LB) Maastricht; *Bastian* (RJB) West Baden; *Beuzer* (VJB) Los Gatos; *Bligh*, S.J. (JFB1) Rome; *Blinzler* (JBz) Prof. NT, Passau, Germany; *Bresnahan* (JFBr); *Broderick* (JFBk) Prof. Ecclesiastical History; *Brooks* (JEB); *Buckley* (FJB) Los Gatos; *Burns* (JAB) West Baden; *Callahan* (ERC) Prof. Dogmatic Theology; *Campbell* (RBC); *Cardoni* (AAC); *Caskin* (JC); *Chênevert* (JPC) Montreal; *Collins* (JJC) Prof. NT and Biblical Greek; *Cornellier* (JGC); *Cortés* (JBC); *Creighton* (MEC) West Baden; *Decker* (NFD); *Doyle* (PD) Upholland College, England; *Dyson*, S.J. (RAD) Prof. Exegesis and Biblical Theology, Pont. Bibl. Inst., Rome; *Garvin* (TRG) Los Gatos; *Giblin* (CHG) West Baden; *Gloster* (GFG); *Graystone*, S.M. (GG) Prof. SS and Moral Theology, St. Mary's Hill, Paignton, S. Devon, England; *Grispino*, S.M. (JAG) Prof. NT Marist Seminary, Framingham, Mass.; *Harvey*, S.J. (JH) Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore; *Herrero* (JHo); *Huesman* (JEH) Prof. OT Alma College, Los Gatos; *Isenecker* (LEI) West Baden; *Jarski* (JCJ); *Johnston* (LJ) Prof. NT Ushaw College, Durham, England; *Kelly* (EFK); *Kerdiejus* (JBK); *King* (WFK) West Baden; *Koester* (WKs) Prof. NT, Phil. Theol. Hochschule Sankt Georgen, Frankfurt-Main, Germany; *Kuchler* (WK) Passau, Germany; *Langevin* (PEL) Montreal; *Laurendeau* (PL) Montreal; *Lynch* (JDL) Montreal; *MacRae* (GWM) Lect. Hebrew Lang. and Lit.; *Mausolf*, O.F.M.Cap. (IJM) Prof. NT St. Anthony Friary, Marathon, Wisconsin; *Mendoza* (LM); *Meyer* (BFM) Los Gatos; *Miller* (EFM) West Baden; *Monks* (JLM) Prof. Dogmatic Theology and History of Liturgy; *North*, S.J. (RN) Dir. Pont. Bibl. Inst., Jerusalem; *O'Connor* (JEO'C); *O'Flynn* (JAO'F) Prof. NT, Maynooth, Eire; *O'Keefe* (VO'K) Prof. Fundamental Theology Woodstock College, Woodstock; *O'Rourke* (JO'R) Prof. NT St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia; *Sant* (CS) Prof. SS, Seminary, Malta; *Saydon*, Msgr. (PPS) Prof. SS, Greek, and Hebrew, Royal Univ., Malta; *Schwank*, O.S.B. (BS) Prof. SS, Beuron, Germany; *Stanley* (DMS) Prof. NT Jesuit Theologate, Toronto; *Verreault* (FV) Montreal; *Vigneault* (RV) Montreal; *Walsh* (JPW); *Weber* (CAW) Los Gatos; *Weiser*, S.J. (FXW) Prof. Theology and German Lang. Emmanuel College, Boston; *Welch* (PCW); *Willmering* (HW) Prof. NT, St. Marys, Kansas.

Editorial Assistants

V. M. Burns	M. A. Hernandez	R. F. Olson	P. J. Ryan	J. A. Donohoe
W. D. Ibach	W. R. Pelletier	L. M. St. Onge	G. F. Gloster	
P. J. McKenna	R. F. Regan	J. T. Sheehan		

NOTE: The contributions of J. Blinzler, W. Kuchler, and B. Schwank were translated by staff members.

SIGLA

The asterisk indicates a Catholic author or publication.

The letter r indicates a book review abstract.

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

INSPIRATION, TEXTS, INTERPRETATION, NT GENERAL

1. J. COPPENS, "L'inspiration et l'inerrance biblique," *EphTheolLov** 33 (1, '57) 36-57.

A reply to observations of Benoit in *RevBib* 63 ('56) 416-422. C discusses remarks on the treatment of inspiration in *Providentissimus*, on the relation between revelation and inspiration, on the notion of instrumentality, and on the proper criteria in the question of inerrancy. C elucidates and defends his position with reference to Henry's double literal sense, and cautions against an all too hasty tendency to ascribe to the primitive community literary forms that could be verified in the preaching of Christ Himself. Henry's position on the Petrine confession at Caesarea can, from a strictly historical point of view, cast doubts on the credibility of the Gospel witness and tradition. C gives twelve conclusions that stem from the debate on inspiration and inerrancy. —V. O'K.

2. M. DE TUYA, "Revelación profética con inspiración bíblica," *CienTom** 83 (260, '56) 473-506.

The object of prophetic revelation in its most proper sense are those truths that do not have any existence in themselves, i.e., contingent futures. Absolutely speaking, revelation requires no natural preparation in the subject, since it is a supernatural act of God. Nor, as St. Thomas tells us, is holiness of life necessary, since charity belongs to the will and revelation to the intellect. This charismatic gift is ordinarily communicated through the instrumentality of the angels. The angelic light prepares the human mind for the congruous reception of the divine illumination. Some of the effects of the act of revealing may be caused independently of angelic cooperation. St. Thomas concludes that prophetic revelation is sometimes achieved not through the species alone but through the influence of the *lumen*. The prophets do not always realize the prophetic character of their prophecy, says St. Thomas, citing the instance of Caiphas. He distinguishes between *expressa revelatio* and revelation *per quendam instinctum*.

Biblical inspiration is defined as the supernatural element which enables the hagiographer to judge a truth with divine certitude. It can exist without revelation. But what is the relation between biblical inspiration and revelation? Both usually have in common the grasp and evaluation of a truth with divine certitude. They differ in the speculative judgment, insofar as the revealed truth may be new, whereas the inspired truth is already known, *via humana*. In the practical judgment revelation and inspiration are identical. If there is a time lapse between the divine communication and the prophet's written composition

of it, is a second revelation necessary at the time of writing? No. The revelation is infallible. In the practical judgment, however, a further inspiration is needed for the hagiographer to judge the communicability of the revealed truth and to direct his will and other faculties accordingly.—L. M.

3. A. M. DUBARLE, "Écriture et Tradition, à propos de publications protestantes récentes," *Istina** 3 (4, '56) 399-416.

During the past few years several Protestant works dealing with the problems of Scripture and tradition have appeared and serve as an invitation to the Catholic to present his views.

(1) H. Diem's two volumes, *Theologie als kirchliche Wissenschaft*, (München: Kaiser-Verlag, 1952, 280 pp.) and *Dogmatik, Ihr Weg zwischen Historismus und Existentialismus*, (1955, 314 pp.), provide an introduction to theological problems and seek to define a theological method which subjects the preaching of the Church to the steadfast control of Scripture. (2) O. Cullmann's *La Tradition. Problème exégétique, historique et théologique* (Col. Cahier théologique, n. 33, 1953, 54 pp.) has provoked lively interest among Catholic readers. For Cullmann there is a practical necessity for tradition in the sense that every reader of Scripture is obliged to have recourse to the assistance of those who have read it before him and to profit from their lights, without however being bound by their interpretation. (3) A conference held at Cambridge, England, during the summer of 1953 by the Evangelical Fellowship of Theological Literature occasioned a small volume (*Scripture and Tradition*, Essays by F. W. Dillistone, etc., London: Lutterworth Press, 1953, 150 pp.) which offers a balanced statement of the pros and cons on points where Christian avowals divide concerning Scripture and tradition. These essays, written by dignitaries and theologians of the Anglican Church, discuss the relationship between Scripture and tradition; tradition in the Church up to the fifth century, the classic doctrine of the Anglican Church on tradition as established by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theologians; nineteenth-century thought on tradition; and the contemporary situation. (4) H. Grass in his book, *Die katholische Lehre von der heiligen Schrift und von der Tradition* (Lüneburg: Heiland-Verlag, 1954, 64 pp.) offers a selection of documents relating to the Catholic teaching on Holy Scripture and tradition. The concern of this collection is to unite the testimony of ecclesiastical writers and hierarchical authorities.

In all of these publications, the essential difficulty opposed to Catholic teaching is that one is not able to impose a doctrine to be held by faith which is not contained in Scripture. In answer to it, the Catholic must emphasize that the biblical books are not methodical treatises or lists of propositions where one can easily remark on first glance the presence or absence of a particular doctrine. To conclude to the absence of a doctrine in Scripture, it would normally be necessary to confirm not only the silence of the texts on the doctrine, but also their opposition to it. For nowhere does Scripture explicitly attribute to itself exclusive authority in matters of faith.—J. E. B.

4. A. M. DUBARLE, "Écriture et tradition, à propos de publications récentes," *Istina** 4 (1, '57) 113-128.

Some recent Protestant views of the Catholic position of the relation between Scripture and tradition have alluded to the definition of the dogma of the Assumption. The misleading comments of O. Cullman and H. Grass which deplore the lack of scriptural arguments in the dogmatic Constitution, and those of H. Diem which overlook the Bull's most significant scriptural argument, show the need of a tradition to interpret scriptural texts. The Protestant inability to understand the Constitution's use of scriptural argumentation in the light of tradition will be solved by a grasp of the two distinct tools used in Catholic exegesis: (1) a solidly scientific methodology harmonizing perfectly with (2) complete submission to the guidance of the magisterium. Documents of the nature of the definition of the Assumption, which employ scriptural arguments in the light of tradition, cannot be expected to present a scientific exegesis. But scientific exegesis, if used to complement the arguments of the Constitution defining the Assumption, can indicate in Scripture the first traces of a doctrine slowly clarified in subsequent tradition. Thus, if Mary has a primary role in the conflict against Satan and sin as indicated in Lk 2:35 and Apoc 12, and an active role in the plan of salvation as suggested by her title of Mother in Jn 19:26 and Apoc 12:17, one is led to believe that these entail more power than could be possessed by a disembodied soul. Admittedly only the seed of the dogma is contained in such passages. Nevertheless, such scriptural exegesis is sufficient to show that the dogma is in complete accord with tradition and justifies the magisterium's use of scriptural argumentation.—R. B. C.

5. M. KARNETZKI, "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 170-180.

The differences among the variant NT texts should not be resolved and forced to yield to the corrected, ironbound, sacrosanct, primitive text; rather should they serve as an indication that the NT writings, even after their completion, are still to be regarded principally as living *tradition*. The texts themselves were not considered so much primary and immutable standards as was the matter which they passed along. A comparison of the Synoptics shows how traditions were modified before incorporation into the texts; a comparison of these modifications with our textual variations reveals such a striking similarity that we are tempted to conclude that the same process was operative in both instances—the process of tradition. Especially late did Acts attain to recognition as Holy Scripture. In the West, as is proved by the "Western Text," this process of development from free tradition to fixed text took longer than it did elsewhere.—J. Bz.

6. P. KATZ, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 191-217.

The textbooks on the canon of the OT take it for granted that our Hebrew Bible preserves the original order of books which was subsequently changed to

that of the "Alexandrian collection." In fact, however, the extent of a collection of sacred writings as revealed in the LXX is based on an older Jewish tradition which was later modified, particularly at the Council of Jamnia, by narrowing of the canon. Three excursuses are added: (1) On Audet's Hebrew-Aramaic list (corrections and supplements to J.-P. Audet, "A Hebrew-Aramaic List of Books of the O.T. in Greek Transcription," *JournTheolStud*, n.s.1, 1950, 135-154); (2) The "Alexandrian Doctrine of Inspiration" (there is no "Alexandrian doctrine of inspiration" from which to explain what is different in the arrangement of the LXX); (3) Concerning the History of the Problem.—J. Bz.

7. J. MOUSON, "De valore normativo decretorum Commissionis Biblicae," *CollMech** 27 (2, '57) 154-157.

The decrees require an external and internal religious assent in matters of faith and morals, but do not bind in matters merely of criticism or history.—E. F. K.

8. F. MUSSNER, "Tagung katholischer Neutestamentler in Bad Soden-Salmunster," *TrierTheolZeit** 66 (3, '57) 177-178.

This second meeting of German Catholic NT exegetes (March 1957) gives a representative picture of their present concerns. K. H. Schelkle (Tübingen) asked whether today's exegetes should prescind from the method adopted by the fathers, who were concerned with establishing unity between the OT and the NT, and whose exegesis had a distinctly Christological bent as well as an inclination towards typology and allegory. J. Michl (Freising) remarked that even though exegesis supplies dogmatic theology with the scriptural proof, that is not its prime purpose. Indeed, today the dogmatic theologian asks of the exegete evidence rather than proof. F. Mussner (Trier), treating of the Protestant's problem of the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, asked whether there are not some criteria by which one can find the Jesus of history in the NT. He asked if examples of such criteria were not to be found in the central position of Jesus in the NT and in the fact of the Resurrection. J. Gewiess (Munich) examined the *homoionoma* of the death of Christ (Rom 6:5) for a deeper understanding which he then employed in the exegesis of that text. J. Kürzinger (Eichstätt) used the *typos didache* (Rom 6:17) to shed light on the ancient right of slavery. A. Vögtle (Freiburg), having the Synoptic problem in view, suggested that the confession of Peter (Mt 16:17-19) is not so much an expression of the expectation of the Messiah according to man's way of thinking (as it is in Mk), but represents a full grasp of the Messianic secret. H. Schürmann (Erfurt) reported his observations on the phenomenon of the words of Christ, suggesting that there was a tendency to transfer these passages from the Jesus of history to the Christ of faith. J. Schmid (Munich) discussed Papyrus Bodmer II. R. Schnackenburg (Bamberg) considered Jn 3:13-21 and 31-36 as two parts of a Johannine homily inserted into the text by a later editor.—J. B. K.

9. E. SARTORI, "La Cuestión Bíblica," *Didascalía** 11 (1, '57) 13-17.

A brief historical outline of the discussions among Catholics on the application of the doctrine concerning the inerrancy of Scripture.—J. Ho.

10. E. SARTORI, "Causas de la cuestión bíblica y sus principios de solución," *Didascalía** 11 (2, '57) 76-81.

Following S. del Prado's *Síntesis histórica de la Cuestión Bíblica*, S exposes the roots of the biblical problem. The solutions, polemics, and deviations which were proposed from the time of the Renaissance until the Encyclical *Providentissimus* are sketched.—J. Ho.

11. E. TROCME, "Simples remarques sur l'emploi de la méthode critique pour l'exégèse du Nouveau Testament," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 ('57) 103-111.

Many consider the exegete as an intruder who undermines the traditional dogmas and weakens the authority of Scripture, and they would like to prohibit him from touching the main parts of the traditional doctrine. The NT exegete must behave as a critic who is criticized by the very object of his research. New discoveries allow him to revise the ideas accepted so far, even with regard to the canon of the NT. As for internal criticism, the exegete will emphasize the literary, and not the historical aspect of the NT, because "it is impossible to write a biography of Jesus." Scriptural analysis will focus on the author's intentions, on his own interpretation of the sacred word, "in order to determine the degree of perverted forms which affect Christian thought."—P. E. L.

12. R. S. WALLACE, "La Parabole et le prédicateur," traduit par F. Ledoux, *BibVieChrét** 18 ('57) 36-50.

[Translated from *Many Things in Parables*, London, 1955.] The key to the interpretation of many parables of Christ is to consider them a challenge: if you are with me, take courage; if against me, beware. The parables are not doctrinal stories nor laws of the spiritual life. They contain a voluntary prophetic element. Some, e.g., C. H. Dodd, suppose that Jesus intended only to allude to His future ministerial events. It is true that the whole atmosphere of the parables is charged with an immediate crisis; yet they were intended from the beginning to refer to our present condition as well as to that of the Jew of the first generation after Christ. Men are still judged today according to their reactions to Christ just as the Jews were judged at the time of our Lord.

The interpretation must not be limited by any definition of "parable." A parable is a comparison. The art of the narrator forces the listener to realize that he is in a similar situation and to make a decision in his own case: e.g., Nathan and David in 2 Sam 12:1-15. Thus the parable is different from the allegory: the former leads to a decision; the latter gives an instruction though it may at times also lead to a decision. Some wrongly affirm that Christ's parables in the beginning had hardly any allegorical elements. Such critics tend to treat the details of the parables as apocryphal.

The preacher on the parables must be guided by five patent considerations: (1) the context of the parable; (2) the fact that the parables form part of the most obscure passages of Scripture, but that the doctrine therein must agree with the teaching of the other clearer sections of the Bible; (3) the homiletic and artistic unity of every parable; (4) certain metaphors in the parables which may be similar to those in the OT but not always; (5) the fact that the parables apply to the condition of the Church in each generation.

An interpretation of Mk 4:10-12 concludes the article.—J. A. G.

GOSPELS (GENERAL)

13. R. BARACALDO, "Mentalidad y caracter de Jesus," *VirtLetr** 15 (60, '56) 381-389.

Hitherto no one had ventured, beginning from laws deduced from the facts in the Gospels, to weigh the intensity of Christ's human, intellectual, sentimental, and volitional dynamism. The present work, the first in its genre, is due to the eminent graphopsychologist Marco Marchesan, Director of the Institute of Scientific Investigations of Milan. For a complete understanding of this book, the study of *Tratado de Grafopsicologia* by the same author is required. The present work is not a biblical exegesis nor a biblical theology in the classical sense; it is rather a Christo-psychology.—J. Ho.

14. J. BLINZLER, "Herodes und der Tod Jesu," *Klerusblatt** 37 ('57) 118-121.

In the apocryphal *Gospel of Gamaliel*, which M.-A. van den Oudenrijn recently discovered in an Ethiopic manuscript, Herod Antipas appears as the one chiefly responsible for the death of Jesus. This concept occurs in several other apocryphal writings, of which the oldest and most important is the *Gospel of Peter*. Some modern scholars too assert that the part played by the tetrarch in the execution of Jesus was considerably more significant than the Gospels at first glance would indicate; so especially V. E. Harlow, (*The Destroyer of Jesus. The Story of Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee* [Oklahoma City, 1954]) and K. Bornhäuser ("Die Beteiligungen des Herodes am Prozesse Jesu," *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift* 40 ['29] 714-718), with whom P. Gaechter agrees on an important point in *ZeitKathTheol* 78 ('56) 232. A careful examination, however, shows that Harlow's thesis is indefensible, and that Bornhäuser's interpretations of certain parts of Lk 23:6-12 are most improbable. Therefore it must be held that Herod neither pronounced Jesus guilty nor passed sentence on Him. On the contrary, by sending the accused back to the Procurator in mock-regal garments, he let Pilate know that he neither took the matter seriously nor intended to pursue it further.—W. K.

15. J. DELORME, "Jésus a-t-il pris la dernière Cène le mardi soir?" *AmiCler** 67 (14, '57) 218-223; (15, '57) 229-234.

John's Gospel puts the death of Christ on the fourteenth of Nisan and does not consider the Last Supper as a paschal meal. On the other hand, the Synop-

tics underline the paschal character of the Last Supper and so date Christ's death on the fifteenth, the first day of the Passover. In an attempt to reconcile this discrepancy, Lagrange formulated the hypothesis that Jesus did not follow the official Jewish calendar of Jerusalem for the Last Supper. Miss A. Jaubert has recently provided an objective foundation in support of this hypothesis. (1) The Qumran MSS have revealed the existence of a very ancient calendar other than the official calendar. It sets the annual paschal feast on Wednesday the fifteenth of the first month of the year. (2) An ancient Christian tradition, attested to by the *Didascalia Apostolorum* as well as by Epiphanius and Victorinus of Pettau (died 304), gives Tuesday evening as the date of the Last Supper and prescribes a fast for Wednesday to commemorate the capture of Christ.

The Gospel accounts of the Passion are reconciled if we admit that John follows the legal calendar, while the Synoptics follow the calendar attested by the Qumran MSS. Among the difficulties thus resolved are the date of the anointing in Bethany, the requirements of the Mishnah in legal matters, and the schedule of the narratives which seemingly crowd too many events into too little time. The commonly admitted origin and literary genre of the Gospel accounts offer no opposition to this hypothesis. Jesus may simply have borrowed Qumran's ancient sacerdotal calendar, or the same calendar might have been in vogue in other communities. Miss Jaubert has not yet resolved all the difficulties raised by her hypothesis, but her ideas show promise.—P. E. L.

16. J. DELORME, "La Cène et la Pâque dans le Nouveau Testament," *LumVie** 31 ('57) 9-48.

The relations between the Last Supper and the Passover are first considered in the light of liturgical practices traced through Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul. Certain accounts of the Christian liturgy tend to disengage it from the setting of the Jewish Passover, but there is also an ancient paschal typology in the Church which accounts for a meal in the surroundings of the Passover rather than a paschal meal. Was the Last Supper really a paschal meal? The Synoptics affirm its paschal character, but from John's account it appears that Jesus did not celebrate the Passover, since He died at the very hour the lambs were immolated and at a time when the Jews did not wish to enter the praetorium lest they be made unclean. However, the Synoptic writings are complex and come from sources or traditions which do not have the same bearing on the problem.

Historically, the recent Qumran MSS reveal data on sacrificial feasts, differences in calendar usage between Qumran and the official priesthood of Jerusalem, which lend probability to some recent hypothetical solutions regarding the problems connected with the Last Supper, its date and paschal character.—J. G. C.

17. J. EUZET, "Remarques sur 'Jerusalem?-Ephese?' de Clemens Kopp," *Div-Thom** 60 (1, '57) 47-74.

In his booklet *Das Mariengrab—Jerusalem?-Ephesus?* (Paderborn, 1955), Clemens Kopp maintains that our Lady was buried in Jerusalem. He lays bare the inadequate foundations of the Ephesus theory. E passes in review the arguments of Kopp for Jerusalem and those against Ephesus, showing the fallacies of both. The Ephesus tradition preserved in the small village of Kirkindje is evaluated together with the revelations of E. C. Emmerick. E concludes: "One would not venture a categorically affirmative answer. We retain therefore the question mark. After weighing and taking due account of all the relevant evidence one has the right and the duty to affirm that the Ephesus tradition carries more weight than that of Jerusalem."—C. S.

18. J. GIBLET, "Les Promesses de l'Esprit et la Mission des Apôtres dans les Évangiles," *Irénikon** 30 (1, '57) 5-43.

The apostles, in preaching the gospel in the face of opposition from constituted authorities, the Sanhedrin, governors, and kings, will be "a witness to them and to the Gentiles" (Mt 10:18). That is, the apostles, condemned for the sake of Christ, are a decisive witness against the powers who apparently crush them. Why? Because they receive the Holy Spirit and are endowed with the spirit of prophecy (Mt 10:19-20). The link between prophecy and martyrdom was traditional in Judaism, as was the link between the activity of the prophets and the gift of the Spirit. Luke, in repeating the logion of Mt and Mk (Lk 12:11-12; 21:12-19), adapts it to the situations in which the early Christians find themselves. We see how the gift of prophecy, which is promised to the Christians called to proclaim their faith in Christ, is in fact a gift of wisdom which comes to them from Christ.

The most important texts concerning the Paraclete appear in a context of persecution (Jn 15:18-16:15). Christ tells His apostles of the persecutions awaiting them in their mission. It is against an eschatological background that He presents these ordeals which are best understood as episodes in the battle which opposes Christ to the world. Here the Paraclete enters bearing witness in favor of Christ in the consciences of the apostles. The Paraclete demonstrates the justice of Christ and irremediably convicts the world of sin. Thus the purpose of the Spirit is above all positive: to make possible for the apostles an understanding of Christ and, through Him, of the Father. It is in view of the Church functioning in this hostile milieu and preaching the message of salvation that the Spirit will be given.—E. F. K.

19. F. J. LEENHARDT, "Réflexions sur la mort de Jésus-Christ," *RevHistPhil-Rel* 37 (1, '57) 18-23.

The eschatological view of the death of Christ permits a better understanding of the Messiah's sufferings. The Gospels link up closely the sufferings of Christ and of His disciples with the coming of the kingdom. The Messiah heaps up

upon His person the sufferings of the chosen people, because in Him culminates the conflict between the realm of the Redeemer and that of Satan. This conflict reaches its climax in the Passion and particularly in the agony: Christ accepts death in order to prolong the time of repentance.—P. E. L.

20. J. LIVER, "The Problem of the Genealogy of the Davidic Family after the Biblical Period," *Tarbiz* (3, '57; in Hebrew) 229-254.

We have no reliable extrabiblical genealogies. *Ta'anit* 4:5 is taken from Neh (cf. 13:31). The tradition making Hillel and Hiyya Davidids is midrashic. "Scholars are of almost unanimous opinion that the tradition in the Gospels relating Jesus to the Davidic line is artificial. The other passages in the NT which make mention of this are not based upon genealogical traditions, but upon the Jewish belief endorsed by the early Christians to the effect that the Messiah had necessarily to emanate from the Davidic family. Jesus did not even consider himself to be of the Davidic family, if we are to believe the early Christian tradition in Mk 12:35-37." Talmudic genealogies tracing Babylonian exilarchs to David are only a jumble of 1 Chr 3; and similar efforts on behalf of the Palestine patriarchs are even more obvious.—R. N.

21. J. MAIWORM, "Leibespflge im Evangelium," *TheolGlaub** 47 (31, '57) 289-295.

While insisting on spiritual priority, the Gospels have many references to the care of the body. M gathers together all passages that mention food, drink, sleep, and rest in connection with our Lord, His disciples, and the multitude. He calls attention to the many bodily cures wrought by Christ. He indicates where and when Jesus accepted an invitation to meals, and how He used these occasions to instruct the guests. Christ, he maintains, had a strong and healthy body, and as long as the care of the body is subordinated to the welfare of the soul, it must be properly sustained.—H. W.

22. S. MEDNER, "Die Tempelreinigung," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 93-112.

In the Synoptics the cleansing of the Temple is a prelude to the trial of Jesus; in John it introduces His public life. The assumption that the event occurred twice is untenable. Which tradition then should be preferred? Of the Synoptic accounts the most primitive is that of Lk; Mk and Mt have altered the original story. The Johannine account, taken as a whole, appears to be a reworking of the Synoptic tradition, which means that it possesses no value as an independent tradition. It also contains a series of false and unlikely details. Thus the selling of sheep and oxen in the holy place may be unhistorical, particularly since it is nowhere attested in Jewish sources. Jesus' curt attitude towards the Jews is intelligible only as the result of many unpleasant experiences; and the incident therefore could not have taken place at the *beginning* of the public life. Since, however, John is otherwise an historically reliable witness, the pericope of the Temple cleansing must stem from a later reviser whose vocabulary betrays him

by the use of the particle *te* in 2:15, which otherwise appears only in verses which are certainly secondary, e.g., 4:42; 6:13 (and to be sure, as in 2:15, always stands between the article and the noun). Jn 2:13-25 seems to be a disturbing foreign substance in the structure of the entire Gospel. Moreover the extraordinary event has no aftereffects. The cleansing of the Temple therefore does not belong to the original plan of the Fourth Gospel. The pericope cannot be an addition to the text made by the author himself but must have been inserted afterwards by another hand, a redactor. The view that this section was missing from the original manuscript is strengthened by the mention of Judea in 3:22, inasmuch as we thus see that the author was not thinking that Jesus had previously been in Judea and Jerusalem. Recently discovered papyri show that the Fourth Gospel was written before the end of the first century, probably between A.D. 75 and 80. But whether written before or at the same time as Mt and Lk, it cannot be dependent upon them. Accordingly the anachronistic references in John to the other two Gospels must be secondary. This holds good for example of the cleansing of the Temple (Jn 2:15) which clearly has Mt 21:12 for a model.—J. Bz.

23. W. NAUCK, "Die Bedeutung des leeren Grabes für den Glauben an den Auferstandenen," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 243-267.

The reports of the empty tomb, as found in the Gospels, are free from theological reflection and completely untouched by the Christology of the early Christian community. The empty sepulchre serves as an aid to our understanding of the most ancient tradition in the Gospels—not, indeed, as a *proof* of the Resurrection (Jn 20:8 should be rendered not: "He saw and believed," but "He saw and was convinced [that the body was not stolen]"); rather, its significance lies in the fact that the dissemination of the news of the empty sepulchre was a preparation for the self-revelation of the risen Savior, by which the faith of Easter was awakened. The faith was born with the self-manifestation of the risen Christ; without this the empty grave remains mute. Within the early Christian community itself—for the sepulchre played no part in missionary preaching—a threefold importance was attached to it: first apologetic, for it silenced those who branded the preaching of the Resurrection as fraud and deceit; secondly theological, for it is a sign pointing to the risen Christ; finally cultic, for there are indications that meetings were held at an empty grave which was known as the tomb of Christ, to celebrate the memory and the realization of the Resurrection. A series of observations demonstrates that we should consider the story of the empty tomb neither as a legend created to serve as a proof for the Resurrection nor as a cult legend; rather, the empty tomb goes back to an *historical* event.—J. Bz.

24. D. F. ROBINSON, "The Parable of the Loaves," *AnglTheolRev* 39 (2, '57) 107-115.

The Gospel stories are to be understood either as pure history or as allegory.

With regard to the incident of the loaves, a comparison of the four Gospels is inconclusive, but we may assume that Mt 6:30-44 provides a close approximation to the original form of the story. Mark intended the story to be taken as an allegory. Unlike the Synoptics, John calls the feeding of the 5000 a sign, but he too interprets the story allegorically. A brief form of the story is already found in 2 Kgs 4:42-44. The additional details can be interpreted within the limits of the Messianic preaching. The five loaves are the five books of the Law; the 5000 are the chosen of Israel; the twelve baskets are the Twelve Apostles.—J. E. H.

25. P. SCHOONENBERG, "Woestijn en Tabor" [Desert and Tabor], *Verbum* (Maastricht) 24 ('57) 50-55.

Texts like Lk 2:40,52 and Mk 13:32 suggest that the *visio beatifica* which the humanity of our Lord possessed throughout His life on earth, need not prevent us from assuming also some kind of development in His consciousness. The stay in the desert and the glorification on Tabor may be viewed as turning points, not only in His outward career, but also in His interior evolution (Gethsemane being another turning point). In both instances Jesus prays (Lk 9:29), since as a human being He has to seek the face of the Father. What He learns in the desert through the experience of solitude, prayer, fasting, and temptations, is going to be decisive for His public ministry when He will continue to reject the worldly conception of the Messiah. On Tabor Moses and Elijah (Law and prophets) speak to Him on His *exodos* (Lk 9:31), for Jesus has to learn from the Scriptures that the Messiah must suffer.—L. B.

26. B. SCHWANK, "War das Letzte Abendmahl am Dienstag in der Karwoche?" *BenMon** 33 (7-8, '57) 268-278.

The results of the works of A. Jaubert and E. Vogt, which, following the Essene sun calendar, place the Last Supper of Christ on Tuesday of Holy Week, are here rendered accessible in detailed form for the German reader for the first time. The particular value of the article lies in three facts: (1) The finding in 4Q of a calendar that clearly mentions a paschal meal on Tuesday evening can be used here as the point of departure of the discussion (it was not yet known by Vogt and was noted by Jaubert only as an addendum). The result is thus no longer only a working hypothesis, but a well-founded theory. (2) In the application of the theory to the Passion account in the Gospels, a partially critical position towards Vogt's explanations is adopted, taking into consideration especially the archaeology of Jerusalem. (3) The question of the consequences which arise from the new knowledge for our new Holy Week order is explicitly stated. The necessity of another change is definitely not the answer. Our present Holy Week liturgy is the liturgy of the Mystical Body of Christ and as such has its own value. It need not copy with minute exactitude the historical conditions of the Passion Week of Christ.—B. S. (Author).

27. E. G. SELWYN, "The Authority of Christ in the New Testament," *NT Stud* 3 (2, '57) 83-92.

The principal impression we get of Christ from the Gospels is one of authority in deeds and in teaching. By reference to the forms of authority familiar to the Jews, it is the authority of a teacher, a rabbi, of a prophet, and of all that is embodied in the title "Son of Man," God's vicegerent with the sovereign's prerogative of pardon and legislation. His authority is therefore that of the Messiah; He fulfills the Old Dispensation; He is the clue to both past and future. The eschatological hope was now realized in the main; the kingdom was transferred to His followers. This Messianic authority is rooted in His obedience. The Resurrection fits in with this; declaring Him "Son of God with power," it ratifies his obedience. This conception of Christ's authority is borne out by other evidence in the NT: (1) the importance attached to the actual saying of our Lord, by direct quotation or by indirect reminiscence; (2) the prevalence of the title "Lord" applied to Jesus. Throughout the Hellenistic world it denoted the highest authority in religious (as in secular) affairs. To the Jewish Christian, it denoted one who stands on the side of God; for the Gentiles, it meant the one and only real "cult-hero"; (3) the stress on tradition, which is centered on the person of Christ. Receiving from the Lord and receiving by mediation are not mutually exclusive, because the Lord stood behind and above those who transmitted the tradition.—L. J.

28. E. SONS, "Zur Todesursache bei der Kreuzigung," *BenMon** 33 (3-4, '57) 101-106.

Medical research upon wounded of World War II gives a clue to the cause of Christ's death. The cause was a type of shock produced by extreme physical punishment that was foreseen and by the consequent strain on the nervous system. Full consciousness and the use of all faculties until sudden death from heart-stoppage characterize this condition. Thus Christ foresaw and experienced extreme physical torment and yet remained fully conscious and able to speak until He died suddenly with a loud cry. The physiological phenomena noted above coincide with the Gospel data. Medical investigation likewise proves that the soldier's lance pierced Christ's Heart on the right side. [The author has a medical degree.]—J. C.

29. P. VAN BERGEN, "L'Entrée messianique de Jésus à Jérusalem," *QuestLit-Par** 38 (1, '57) 9-24.

To penetrate the fuller sense of Christ's entry in triumph into Jerusalem is to recognize the religious significance which this event had for the Evangelists (Mt 21:1-17; Mk 11:1-11; Lk 19:29-48; Jn 12:1-19) and to reject the oversimplification of Bultmann's demythologizing. Closely connected with the contrast between the hatred of the Pharisees aroused by the raising of Lazarus and the parallel enthusiasm of the people, the triumph's profound significance

is based: (1) upon the symbolism of entry upon the colt of an ass never before ridden, and so signifying Messianic kingship and the sacredness of the act; (2) upon the reaction of the disciples and followers which witnesses to the miracles of Jesus as divine, includes psalms of praise reserved for Israel's kings, and surrounds the authoritative act by which Jesus cleanses the Temple of His Father amid Messianic praises from the children; (3) finally, upon the distinct consciousness manifested by Jesus of His kingship as He accepts humbly, not as a warrior, adulation which he had previously refused. Thus, the concrete actions of Jesus point to the prophecies in Zech 9:9-10 and Isa 26:19; 29:18; 35:5; 61:1 which promise a king-Messiah, just and victorious but humble and bringing peace, one who will heal every disease and infirmity in establishing the kingdom of God.—J. F. Br.

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

30. J. B. BAUER, "Procellam cur sedarit Salvator," *VerbDom** 35 (2, '57) 89-96.

When the apostles cry, "We are perishing," Christ takes the words in a spiritual sense and replies, "As yet you have not faith"—because you are worried about this temporal life, which is to be lost for the sake of eternal life. Christ rebukes the tempest in order to prove His power of preserving *true* life (in the Johannine sense).—J. F. Bl.

31. M.-F. BERROUARD, "Le mérite dans les Évangiles synoptiques," *Istina** 2 ('56) 191-209.

The word *merit* is not used in the Sacred Scriptures. Is it an anthropomorphism or a reality? In the Synoptics the Kingdom of God is given by God, but attained by human cooperation. The gratuity of God's call is clear from the preaching of our Lord (Lk 4:18-19; 19:12; 15:4-10). It is accomplished through grace (Mt 16:16-17; 11:25-27; Lk 10:21-22), with which man must freely cooperate (Mk 4:9,23; Mt 11:41-42; Lk 11:31-32). He must do penance to receive pardon (Lk 15:20; 7:36-50; 23:39-43; 18:13-14; 19:8-9; Mt 6:12; 18:23-35). The kingdom is open to all, but actual entrance into it depends on man's free will (Mk 10:15; Lk 18:17; 14:16-20; Mt 22:5-6; Lk 7:30; Mt 21:28-32; 23:37; Lk 13:34). The same cooperation is demanded to attain the kingdom in heaven (Mk 10:28-30; Mt 19:28-29; Lk 18:29-30; Mk 7:35; Mt 10:22; 24:13). Observance of the commandments is necessary (Lk 10:25-28; Mt 7:21-23; Lk 13:25-27; Mt 5:20), an observance that comes from the heart (Mt 6:1,2,4-6,16,18; 23:27-28; Lk 16:15; 18:9-14; 21:1-4; Mk 12:41-44).

Misthos is clearly used in the sense of a reward due in justice for certain works (Mt 5:12; Lk 6:23; Mt 5:46; 10:41-42; Mk 9:41). This sense is emphasized in Mt by the verb *apodidomi* and in Lk by the verb *antapodidomi*. The same idea is contained in the figure of a heavenly treasure (Mt 6:19-20; Lk 12:33; Mk 10:21; Mt 19:21; Lk 18:22). The nature of the reward will be

determined by the judge according to the conduct of each person (Mt 12:41-42; Lk 11:31-32; Mt 10:32-33; Lk 12:8-9; Mt 25:31-46; 16:27; 7:1-2; Lk 6:37-38; Mt 12:36-37). Many details of this judgment are elaborated in the Parables of the Wedding Feast, the Unjust Steward, Lazarus and the Rich Man, the Foolish Virgins, the Talents. God gives the reward as the sovereign master faithful to His own justice. He accomplishes the order which His own love has conceived. This justice is paternal, a heritage from a heavenly Father to those who accept the call to sonship (Mt 6:1,4,6,18; Lk 6:38; Mt 5:9). The relation of good works to the kingdom on earth is illustrated by the Parable of the Sower; the words of Christ at the last judgment show their relation to the kingdom in heaven. Grace and cooperation are the fundamental elements. —J. L. M.

32. C. CHARLIER, "L'Action de grâces de Jésus (Luc 10,17-24 et Matth. 11,25-30)," *BibVieChrét** 17 ('57) 87-99.

To study Christ in the Johannine logion of Lk 10:17-24 and Mt 11:25-30 we must see the passages in their historical and literary context. Almost identical on the main verses, Lk and Mt differ widely in the historical introduction and literary conclusion. Mt omits the precise setting as not to his purpose; Lk places it at the return of the seventy disciples. Lk seems supported by the connection both make between this thanksgiving and the condemnation of those who reject the preaching of the gospel. In the literary context both follow the pattern of OT thanksgivings except in abbreviating the traditional ending of invitation and promise. Mt states the invitation; Lk gives the promise; neither is complete without the other. The final text then reads: Lk 10:17-21; Mt 11:28-30; Lk 10:23-24. In this reconstruction we may note: the connection of the "little ones" with the prophecy of Jeremiah and of the "meek and humble" with the Isaian Servant; the unity of the "meek and humble" Christ with the vibrant Christ of Mk who upsets human standards; and Christ as the Word revealing the Father. Combining the Synoptic emphasis on the humility of the disciple and the Johannine emphasis on the Word's revelation of the Father, this passage shows the unity of the Christ presented in the four Gospels and gives the lie to any supposed later fabrication of a mystic Christ by John.—J. A. G.

33. O. CULLMANN, "Que signifie le sel dans la parabole de Jésus?—Les évangélistes, premiers commentateurs du Logion," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 36-43.

The order of the events of Jesus' life is a pure literary creation of the Evangelists. Therefore the context of Christ's preaching manifests their literary and theological personality and the interpretation which they gave to His words. The Synoptics situate the Parable of the Salt in different contexts, but they interpret the essential idea in exactly the same way: the salt symbolizes the spirit of sacrifice which is an essential quality for a disciple of Christ. This indicates that, while the apostles were independent of one another on the ques-

tion of context, their interpretation goes back to a very old tradition and retails probably the true meaning of Christ's words.—P. E. L.

34. J. DUPONT, "La Brebis Perdue et la Drachme Perdue," *LumVicSupp** 34 (June, '57) 15-23.

Jesus often uses two closely related parables, symmetrically constructed, to illustrate some particular lesson. One good example of such a "double" or "coupled" parable is found in Lk 15:1-10. Others are found in Lk 14:28-32; Mt 13:44-46; Mk 3:24-25; Lk 12:24-28; Mt 6:26-30. Of great interest in a study of the parables found in Lk 15:1-10 is the different purpose the parables serve in Lk and Mt. Mt gives only the Parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt 18:12-14) and includes it among the instructions Jesus gives to His apostles concerning their obligations and attitude as pastors of His Church. In Lk's account Jesus tells the parables for the benefit of the scribes and Pharisees, on one of the many occasions when they murmured against Him because He was associating so freely with "publicans and sinners." Jesus justifies His predilection for "publicans and sinners" by illustrating God's solicitude for men. In Mt the emphasis is on the seeking; in Lk, on the joy of finding. In Mt the use to which the parable was put shows that there was a concern with pastoral problems in the primitive Church, hence the perspective, or point of view, of the parable is changed. The immediate import of the parable on the occasion when Jesus spoke it is less important in Mt's eyes than its application at the time he was composing his Gospel.—A. A. C.

35. F. GRYGLEWICZ, "The Gospel of the Overworked Workers," *CathBib-Quart** 19 (2, '57) 190-198.

The Tosephta states that the working day starts at sunrise, and ends with the appearance of the stars; the Mishnah says at sunset. At Jerusalem during harvest this would mean more than thirteen hours of work. The employer fixed the task in advance. If the worker finished early, he could have his task increased, provided it was somewhat lighter, or have his pay reduced for the time he did not work. He had to dispense with grace before meals, and that after meals was a shortened form called "workman's grace." For other prayers, if he was on a scaffolding or in a tree, he had to stay where he was. Hillel said he should say the Shema while working. Employers escaped paid holidays by hiring by the day. Because the assigned task was so great, many workers had to finish on the Sabbath. Scarcity of work left the workers wholly at the mercy of the employers.—T. R. G.

36. R. KOCH, "Die Wertung des Besitzes im Lucasevangelium," *Biblica** 38 (2, '57) 151-169.

In OT times riches were generally looked upon as a mark of divine favor. The same belief persists in NT times, especially in Matthew and Mark. Luke seems to disagree, but the disagreement is only apparent, as it lies rather in

the different standpoint from which riches are viewed. The Christ of the third Gospel does not condemn riches, but only their bad use, the strenuous striving after riches. He who seeks riches disregards God's dominion over all creatures. Man has received from God the right to use riches, not absolute ownership. He who runs after riches turns his back to God and offers his services to Mammon. The insatiable avidity for riches is an obstacle to entrance into the kingdom of God. Therefore woe to the rich and blessed are the poor, as we see in the Parable of Dives and Lazarus. If the senseless striving after riches leads to perdition, the good use of riches is a great help for salvation. This point is brought out in the Parable of the Unjust Steward. Luke has been called the Evangelist of the poor. Christ was born of poor parents and He Himself came on earth to bring a happy message to the poor.—P. P. S.

37. X. LÉON-DUFOUR, "Pour approfondir les évangiles synoptiques: un nouvel instrument de travail," *NouvRevThéol** 79 (3, '57) 296-302.

The new *Concordance des évangiles synoptiques*, published by Desclée, gives in a handy folder-format a panoramic view of each Gospel and of its relations with the other two. Each important passage is represented by a title printed on a colored strip. The three primary colors represent the Synoptics, and secondary colors represent passages found in more than one of the Synoptic Gospels. To the right of each strip, a circle or circles, in the same color scheme, represent parallel passages in the Synoptics. These circles bear numbers which refer to the order in which the passages occur in the Synoptics, and in this way serve a dual purpose—that of indicating both the existence and the contextual relations of similar passages. The *Concordance* thus gives in broad outline a survey of the complex Synoptic material, and its use should be supplemented by the use of a synopsis for the finer details of the text.—F. V.

38. C. MASSON, "Le reniement de Pierre. Quelques aspects de la formation d'une tradition," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 24-35.

A critical analysis of Mk 14:66-72 brings out two points that are difficult to explain: Peter leaves after his first denial and the cock crows twice. A hypothesis may solve these difficulties: Mark's account may be the combination of two older traditions. Mark seems to be the author of the three denials in their first form. Mt and Lk follow his account rather than his sources. These include the three denials, but drop out the first crowing of the cock as untrue and pointless. Mark speaks of *three* denials for theological, not for historical reasons. He wishes to explain the failure of Jesus by the refusal of all, even the disciples, to support Him. A triple denial by Peter shows this refusal more clearly, and the two crowings of the cock reinforce it.—P. E. L.

39. H. W. MONTEFIORE, "God as Father in the Synoptic Gospels," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 31-46.

H. F. D. Sparks denies that Jesus held a doctrine of universal fatherhood, i.e., God's paternity in that He is responsible for the existence of all, His

general providence, and His paternal relationship in that He is the Person to whom all are bound. This is challenged. Admittedly Jesus would speak of God as Father not in this metaphysical sense, but in the Jewish—an experience of God, giving an attitude of piety. But did Jesus regard this as the right of all? Mark gives no explicit references, but silence here is not denial. Analysis shows that the key ideas in universal fatherhood are assumed throughout. In material common to Mt and Lk the four relevant passages occur in the Sermon on the Mount. After examination in their full context in both Gospels, only the Lord's Prayer and Mt 7:3 give clear references to God as Father of all. Peculiar to Mt there are nine references to God as Father of all who approach Him. In Luke's special material there is nothing explicit, but the Parable of the Prodigal Son is good supporting evidence. The phrase "children of God" generally refers to those who specially resemble the Father. By his actions Jesus showed God as Father of even the most degraded. Thus Jesus was concerned with an attitude of filial piety, which was possible for all, with the doctrine of universal fatherhood implicit throughout. This inquiry throws light on the methodology of Synoptic scholarship.—L. J.

40. S. MUNOZ IGLESIAS, "Los Evangelios de la Infancia y las infancias de los héroes," *EstBib** 16 (1, '57) 5-36.

The infancy of our Savior was not a part of the primitive catechesis. Furthermore, Lk and Mt, in relating Jesus' infancy, do not show literary dependence on one another. Therefore, were there any literary patterns that they could have used? Such a question is posed today from the point of view of literary genres. Do the narrations of Mt and Lk follow the usual patterns concerning the infancies of heroes customarily found in literature? A careful comparison of Jesus' infancy with that of profane heroes like the Babylonian King Sargon, the Egyptian kings, Buddha, and Caesar Augustus seems to deny it. Non-biblical literature recounts no annunciation previous to a hero's conception. Nor does it contain any story of real parthenogenesis. Likewise lowliness of origin despite royal ancestry, birth of the hero during a journey of his mother, and presentation of the hero in a temple, are features not shared by other examples of the literary genre considered.—J. B. C.

-
41. V. M. BENASSI, "'Chi è mia madre, chi sono i miei fratelli?' (Mt. 12,48ss)," *Marianum** 18 (3-4, '57) 347-354.

Jesus is affirming the supernatural nature of His kingdom and the superiority of supernatural relationships over all natural bonds. The text can mean: My mother and brethren are kinsmen to me *not only* because of the human bonds by which we are related, *but rather* because they fulfill the will of my heavenly Father. The basis for this interpretation is the principle of *paradoxical nega-*

tion, an idiomatic form of expression found especially in Hebrew, but also in Aramaic, Arabic, and Greek. Thus, the statement expressed as "Not A, but B" is sometimes to be understood to mean "B, rather than A," or "Not so much A, as B," or "Not A, but rather B." B uses the term *paradoxical negation*. H. Kruse ("Die dialektische Negation als semitischen Idiom," *Vetus Testamentum* 4 [1954] 383-400) terms the principle *dialectical negation*. Others use the terms *relative negation* or *comparative negation*.—A. A. C.

42. H. CLAVIER, "Matthieu 5:39 et la non-résistance," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 44-57.

Mt 5:39 says that unjust aggression must not be met with *offensive* resistance. Jesus is opposed to the aggressive attitude of the insulted person, but even more so to the feelings of hostility which move him. It is an essential point of the New Law that Christian love wishes good to the insulter, and regards him first of all as a brother of the insulted. Possibly Mt 5:39 contains an ironical attack on certain Jewish groups of the time. One thing is certain—Christ formulates a positive and down-to-earth love of enemies. He does not preach non-resistance at all times (as may be seen from His attitude when the high priest's servant gives Him a blow), since an unvarying policy of non-resistance would foster evil.—P. E. L.

43. J. DELORME, "Marie habitait-elle chez Joseph?" *AmiCler** 66 (51, '56) 774.

According to the interpretation of Mt 1:18-25 by Delatte, Mary was already living with Joseph, at the time of the Annunciation. Does the text support this interpretation? Considering the nuptial customs of the period, the words *desponsata*, *vir*, *conjux* can be applied to persons betrothed as well as to persons married. In the same way, *antequam convenirent* can refer either to the conjugal relations of the persons already living together or to the first entrance of the betrothed into the house of her fiancé. On the other hand, in v.20, the verb *paralambanein*, in the aorist infinitive, should be translated: "Fear not to take unto thee . . .," in the meaning of an action begun but not continued. Marriage properly speaking becomes a reality only at v.24.—R. V.

44. J. DELORME, "Sens du texte de S. Matthieu (V,31-32) sur le divorce," *AmiCler** 66 (51, '56) 772-774.

Is it true that some Catholic exegetes interpret the restriction *nisi fornicationis causa* in the following way: one could put away his wife only if one were living in concubinage with her? Such is, in fact, the interpretation of Bonsirven, endorsed by Benoit and Cazelles. It is supported by the following arguments: (1) the consideration of adultery on the part of the woman alone does not respect the perfect equality of man and wife in face of the requirements demanded by the unity of marriage; (2) if Jesus meant adultery, in a text

where He is contrasting the Old Law with the New, He would seem simply to adopt the position of Shammaï; (3) main argument: the word *porneia* does not correspond to the Hebrew word meaning adultery (Greek: *moicheia*), but to words whose root is *znh*, notably *zenout*, which designates prohibited and irregular unions. Therefore, in Mt 5:31-32, Jesus prohibits every matrimonial break-up, but He makes an exception in the case of concubinary unions: these should be broken up.—R. V.

45. K. FOSTER, "Tu es Petrus: the conclusions of the Dean of Christ Church," *Tablet** 209 ('57) 354.

NT studies of recent years have shown a definite trend towards the Catholic position on the Church and the role of St. Peter. J. Lowe, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in his *Saint Peter* (Oxford, 1957), reaches the following conclusions: (1) Peter was Jesus' leading disciple and the Rock on which He built His Church; (2) after the Ascension Peter was head of the Church for some years, but then gave place to James, at least in Jerusalem; (3) he very probably suffered martyrdom in Rome; (4) the "Rock-function" conferred on him by Christ, though unique, was not transmitted to a successor. L agrees with O. Cullmann, save that (2) is stated more cautiously, and Mt 16:17-19 is not shifted into the context of Lk 22:31-32. His defence of the authenticity of Mt 16:17-19 is valuable. Chief objections to his theories are: that he forces the texts of Acts 15 and Gal 2:7-12 to show that Peter's authority diminished in his lifetime; that he fails to do justice to the "majestic text" of Mt 16 by interpreting it simply as the task of being *chronologically* the first ruler of the Church; and, lastly, that he implies that post-apostolic acceptance of the Petrine succession had no warrant from the Holy Spirit, either directly, or through the mouth of Peter himself. Though NT evidence does not prove the Petrine succession at Rome, at least it does not contradict it, and may be said to prepare the way for it.—G. G.

46. E. KLOSTERMANN, "Zum Verständnis von Mt 6:2," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 280-281.

Mt 6:1-6 and 6:16-18 originally formed one connected text dealing with the three *opera supererogatoria*—almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. The three sections have received exactly parallel treatment: first, *all* hearers are warned about the failings of the hypocrites; next follows a positive counsel to each *individual* listener; finally, there is a reference to God who rewards the just. This pattern is broken only in 6:2a, where the individual is addressed. Here the traditional text should be changed and the plural substituted for the singular. The singular may have made its way into the text very early, by a false analogy with 6:3—or could it have been occasioned by an erroneous translation from the Aramaic?—J. Bz.

47. J. RACETTE, "L'Évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," *SciencEccl** 9 (1, '57) 77-82.

The first two chapters of Mt relate facts and events of a more or less miraculous kind, nowhere to be found in other NT writings. Nevertheless, a close theological and literary analysis reveals the Infancy Gospel to be in perfect harmony with the rest of Mt.—P. L.

48. K. RAHNER, "Nimm das Kind und seine Mutter," *GeistLeb** 30 (1, '57) 14-22.

Exegetes commonly hold that after Joseph had discovered that Mary was with child, he refrained from asking her about it, and that Mary did not volunteer any information. Subtle inquiries are made as to the reason each kept silent, and why Joseph decided to put her away secretly. The phrase "by the Holy Spirit" in Mt 1:18 is generally regarded as Matthew's explanation of Mary's condition, which Joseph found out about only later. But that emendation is justified only if the text as it stands is unintelligible. An alternate explanation is this: Joseph discovered Mary's condition and learned its explanation when he asked her about it. Then Mt 1:18 has its full significance: Mary was found by Joseph to be with child by the Holy Spirit. What would be more natural than such a question, asked of a woman Joseph loved and trusted? And ought Mary to have kept silent? Had she no confidence in Joseph and his willingness to believe? Joseph had a right to know the truth, and Mary had no right to conclude that he would be informed by a miracle when she could have explained so easily. The angelic message in Mt 1:20 need not be the first idea Joseph had of the virgin birth. Can it not be a heavenly confirmation of what he had already learned from Mary? Would a second witness in such a matter be superfluous or meaningless? It is completely arbitrary to conclude from Mt 1:20 that during his doubt Joseph knew nothing of the heavenly origin of the Child, since Mt 1:18 says that Joseph already knew of it, if we give this verse its full sense. Once Joseph knew of the virgin birth, he had even more reason for putting Mary away privately: heaven had sent this maiden a Child, had filled her with the Holy Spirit: what was more natural than that Joseph would not dare to intrude himself in this relationship? In fact, if he had actually doubted Mary's fidelity, he could not have put her away privately, in all fairness to her, without first asking her about it. Perhaps it was not proper, even when he knew the truth, to think of putting Mary away, but we cannot expect that Joseph understood, as the Church has ever since Augustine: "This Child is mine; I am His father because He was born into my marriage; His mother is my wife." Thus, the angel told Joseph to do what he did not dare to do: to give the Child his name, to make Him a son of David by taking Mary and the Child. Consequently, Joseph is not simply an incident in the biography of Christ, but has a place in the NT *Heilsgeschichte*, and a holiness which is in proportion to his function in that history.—I. J. M.

49. E. VON RACZECK, "Selig, die hungern und dursten nach der Gerechtigkeit, denn sie werden gesättigt werden" (Mt 5,6), *BenMon** 33 (1-2, '57) 46-49.

V analyzes the motivation and motive power of "hunger and thirst for justice" under the various kinds and degrees of suffering in this life, especially the suffering caused by the consciousness of our own weakness and sins.—F. X. W.

50. P. WERNBERG-MØLLER, "A Semitic Idiom in Matt v.22," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 71-73.

In Mt 5:22 *eike* is found in many MSS, but not in Vaticanus or Sinaiticus. How is this explained? The Manual of Discipline, like Jer and Ez, uses "unjustly" to stress inexcusable sin. Possibly Mt originally used this Semitic idiom, and the Greek translator rendered it literally, changing a categorical statement to a conditional. Later writers, either recognizing the original idiom or feeling *eike* unsuitable in the context of a categorical denunciation, omitted it.—L. J.

-
51. T. A. BURKILL, "St. Mark's Philosophy of History," *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 142-148.

The suffering and humiliation of Christ are for Mark part of God's saving plan. But it is a transient phase, leading up to glory. In fact, Mk would distinguish four phases in God's plan: (1) the period of preparation ending with John the Baptist, (2) the period of obscurity during Christ's earthly ministry, (3) the period of open proclamation after the Resurrection, and (4) the eschatological period of fulfillment. Yet Mk does not succeed in integrating the obscurity of the earthly career with the future glory. The soteriological process seems to be governed by a law of retribution, reversing the situation of the earthly ministry. This bipolarity appears in his treatment of the matter. He treats of the Transfiguration as revealing the glory of Christ, but makes no reference to the coming afflictions; he deals with the Lord's humiliation in the Passion referring only once to the ultimate triumph.

Mark's view, therefore, is largely prospective, looking forward to future glory. There is, however, a counter-tendency leading him to attach some intrinsic importance to the incarnate life. This even leads him to overstep the limits of his doctrine of the secret and to display the glory openly: thus in 14:62, the secret is revealed even to outsiders; something of the glory of the parousia lights up the humiliation of the Passion. Here another motive for the declaration is to ascribe responsibility for the crucifixion to the Jews. The secret is partly revealed to the Apostles also, in spite of Mark's stress on their failure to understand. But this partial revelation even in the time of obscurity is a preparation for the role of the Apostles as future teachers and pillars of the church.—L. J.

52. C. E. FAW, "The Outline of Mark," *JournBibRel* ('57) 19-23.

The true structure of Mark is that of a series of ten sections, each one marked out by a pronounced motif of thought, later ones accumulative of the motifs of the earlier ones, but each section with its motif underscored by refrains which hold the section together, and brought to a climactic summary by a well-chosen saying from Jesus or an editorial summary that highlights the mood of the section. Geography is minor, applying to the over-all Galilee-to-Jerusalem movement with sudden shifts in locale, especially at the beginning of each section. Chronology, too, is subordinate, although there is the general over-all movement from the baptism of Jesus to His death. The ten indigenous sections of Mark are indicated with their central motifs.—R. A. D.

53. H. KAHLEFELD, "Jünger des Herrn," *GeistLeb** 30 (1, '57) 1-6.

Mk 8:34-8 teaches the basic requirements for being a follower of Jesus. Jesus calls His disciples together after gathering the crowd around Himself. In the presence of the crowd, He teaches the disciples, for all must hear His words; it belongs to His Messianic office to draw all to Himself. Jesus did not restrict Himself to a small inner circle of disciples, but invited all to follow Him. Not all, however, are to follow Him in His travels, for the word *follow* has a twofold meaning as used by the Evangelists. In a special sense, it means to follow Jesus wherever He goes, as the schools of the prophets followed the OT prophets. In a more fundamental sense, following Jesus consists in giving oneself over to Christ, to follow Him not in His travels, but in mind and heart, and so to render service to the gospel. That this latter group was already distinct from the inner circle of disciples during the mortal life of Christ is clear from the reference to the 500 disciples gathered together after the Resurrection (1 Cor 15:6). The essential requirements for both groups are the same: to deny oneself and to seek only the will of God. Without that, there is neither discipleship nor salvation.—I. J. M.

54. P. R. WEIS, "A Note on *Pygmei*," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 233-236.

This note studies various interpretations based on the assumption that the word is a translation or mistranslation from the Aramaic. Two such interpretations take it to express the Talmudic technical term "rubbing," either as a ritual note on how the washing should be done, or as denoting a substitute for actual washing, simply rubbing the dry hands together. In the latter case the writer would have misunderstood and added "washing with water." But this is a needless addition and, in any case, there is no evidence for such a technical term.

Two other interpretations take it to refer to the part of the hand to be washed. For Torrey, it means "the fist," but the Hebrew on which this is based (*gamad*) is a misreading for the Aramaic word "at all" (*gamar*). The main objection to this interpretation is that the original writer would have been stressing the fact that the Jews never ate at all without washing; whereas

it was common knowledge that washing was required only before the consumption of bread. Black assumes that it is a Talmudic note directing that certain kinds of washing should be "up to the wrist." This is doubtful, but even if we adapt it by saying that the word "fist" was confused with the word "joints of the fingers," there is still the difficulty that the dative is used to mean "up to" the fist.

It is perhaps best to see the word as referring to the vessel from which the pouring was done. This may have been "garaph," which became "agaraph," a word which is translated "fist" in the LXX. Or it may have been "taphah," which certainly means a handbreadth and is also used, in a tannaitic note, to mean the special pitcher used for the washing of hands.—L. J.

-
55. P. BENOIT, "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 169-194.

Did Luke receive his information concerning John the Baptist from a document emanating from Baptist circles? To answer this question, three points must be examined: the language, the style, and the portrait of John the Baptist.

In the annunciation to Zachary, there are many remarkable Lukan expressions. There are many similarities to LXX style, but this also is characteristic of Luke; and along with these there are non-Septuagintal Lukan expressions which mark the whole as Luke's work. The question whether this is an original work of Luke's or a translation of a Semitic original is best answered by testing two hypotheses: can the Greek be explained by reference to the Hebrew as against the LXX? or does a Hebrew original fail to explain the Greek? The arguments for the latter are more decisive. Therefore Luke composed in biblical style, with reminiscences of the LXX, but as a result of personal composition.

Within the account there are various motifs which have clearly recognizable parallels: for the miraculous birth, the promise of Isaac to Abraham and Sara and the births of Samson and of Samuel; for the angelic messenger, Daniel and Tobit; for the appearance in the Temple, stories in rabbinic Judaism. But these do not determine the nature of the story; and there are many other details of time, place, and persons which can only be explained as being due to a historical tradition skilfully edited. Nothing suggests that the editor was a follower of the Baptist; everything suggests it was Luke.

The portrait of John is that of a prophet, one whose task is to convert men, and that of the precursor of the Messiah. This portrayal depends on the OT data, on tradition, and on Luke's own style; none of it is specifically "Baptist."

In the Benedictus, the language points to a Hebrew original which may have been translated into Greek and then retouched by Luke. The structure shows a unity of thought and strophe, if we allow that vv.76-77 are an insertion by Luke. The thought is partly OT and partly NT, especially in the curious mixture of both in the phrase "raise the horn of salvation" (cp. the NT double

sense of "raise": to lift up and to raise from the dead). It may well have been a piece of synagogue liturgy before being taken over by the early Church and finally used here by Luke. There is nothing specific to Baptist circles in it. The picture of John is also again traditional; one can see in Acts 13:26, 38; 13:23, 24; and Lk 3:3, 6 the idea of John announcing salvation, the remission of sins. Nor is there any positive indication of dependence on Qumran literature.

The account of John's birth is not the source of the account of our Lord's birth. The parallel between the two has been much exaggerated; the contrast is equally striking. This Infancy Gospel is clearly an extension of the theology of the Incarnation; Luke, having written his Gospel, decides to push its significance back to the very birth of Christ and finds means of bringing out the significance by describing John as precursor even from the moment of their respective births.—L. J.

56. H. J. CADBURY, " 'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts," *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 128-132.

In spite of various explanations, the "we" passages remain a problem, specifically in the abrupt introduction and abandonment of the first person plural. A possible explanation may be found by considering these beginnings and endings. Consider first the endings. In 16:17 we have: "She (the ventriloquist girl) followed Paul and us"; 21:18: "On the following day Paul went in with us to James"; 28:16: "And when we came to Rome Paul was allowed to stay by himself." In each case, we are prepared for the abandonment of the "we" by the dissociation of Paul from "us." In other words, it is Paul who is distinguished from the "we," not the author from Paul and his companions.

There is no corresponding preparation at the beginning of each section, but such warning has in fact been adequately given in Lk 1:3, which is an introduction to the whole work Luke-Acts. The key phrase is *parekolouthekoti anothen*. The common interpretation of the verb, "to investigate," has no lexical support. The correct meaning is "to be present at" and implies a contrast with the lack of firsthand knowledge on the part of those who were not participants in the events. The author is distinguishing the information he has from others present "from the beginning" from that which he knows by personal participation "from a good way back" (for a similar accurate distinction between *ap'arches* and *anothen*, see Acts 26:4f.). The section of his writing for which the author is claiming personal participation is Acts as a whole or its later part. We are thus prepared for the use of the first person plural in these parts.—L. J.

57. C. P. CEROKE, "Luke 1, 34 and Mary's Virginity," *CathBibQuart** 19 (3, '57) 329-342.

Mary's famous question, "How shall this happen, since I do not know man?" does not necessarily refer to a vow of virginity. In fact, the attitude toward marriage common at that time and her state of espousal would have rendered

such a vow impossible. But her words probably indicate a state of mind opposed to conjugal relations. This is established from the literary form of Jdg 6:11-24 and the historical intent of Luke's narrative. The fact that her question accepts the maternity as a future fact to be accomplished, but throws all the emphasis on the mode of how it will be accomplished, shows that Mary had not developed a final decision on the question of marital relations. Such an attraction to virginity is not incompatible with Mary's environment or her state of espousal. This interpretation of the verse is more probable than attributing to Mary an extraordinary perception of Isa 7:14 or understanding her question as a rejection of conjugal relations before the period of espousals was terminated by the marriage ceremony.—F. J. B.

58. J. DUPONT, "Le repas d'Emmaus," *LumVie** 31 ('57) 77-92.

The story of Emmaus is studied from three aspects, the literary genre of the text, its historical truth, its doctrinal signification. Unlike the principal apparitions, this one does not appear to be primarily of apologetic value; rather it shows the love and concern of Christ for individual followers. Its primary aim is to edify. Neither Matthew, John, nor Paul mention this incident because their principal concern is the apostolic tradition of the Church. Luke alone includes numerous details which were not directly connected with the Apostles. The pertinent texts from Luke plus the fact that the Greek mentality, for which Luke wrote, would not interpret that "breaking of bread" as an ordinary gesture, justify the interpretation that Christ gave the Eucharist to the disciples at Emmaus. The explanation of the Scriptures prepares for the recognition of the living and present Christ, while "the breaking of bread" (the Eucharist) gives to the believer the living and present risen body of Christ.—J. E. O'C.

59. T. F. GLASSON, "Water, Wind and Fire (Luke iii.16) and Orphic Initiation," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 69-71.

One form of Orphic initiation used wind, water, and fire in a threefold purgation in preparation for the future life. Is there a connection here with the Baptist in Mt 3:11 and Lk 3:16? Could an Orphic usage have come to the Baptist through the Essenes? But there is no evidence either that the Essenes used this practice, or that John was an Essene. More probably the Baptist used OT precedents, and Orphic parallels are a coincidence.—L. J.

60. R. LAURENTIN, "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (II)," *Biblica** 38 (1, '57) 1-23.

[Cf. *NTA* 1 (2, '57) no. 191.] The theory of a Hebrew source in the Infancy Gospel is proved by further etymological allusions drawn from the names of Zachariah, Mary, and Elizabeth in the Magnificat and the Benedictus. Confirmation of the proposed etymology of the name of Mary (Miriam) is found in the Ras Shamra texts, which have the word *mrym*, "exalted" or "elevation, eminence." The etymological allusion to the name of Mary in the first

verse of the Magnificat is another confirmation of the attribution of the song to Mary.—P. P. S.

61. H. F. D. SPARKS, "St. Luke's Transpositions," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 219-223.

Jeremias (*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*) says that Luke does not favor transpositions of the material he has in common with Mark. To test this, four groups of examples are considered: of words or phrases within a sentence, of words or matter within a section, of words or matter transposed from one section to another, and of transposition of sections or subject-matter of sections. It need not necessarily be concluded that Luke favors transpositions, but he is certainly not "an enemy" of them.—L. J.

62. B. SCHWANK, "'Wer ist mein Nächster?' (Lk 10,29), Eine Erklärung des Evangeliums des 12. Sonntags nach Pfingsten," *BenMon** 33 (7-8, '57) 292-295.

In this brief sermon, delivered in 1955, the usual interpretation of the Sunday Gospel, making it the lesson of the parable to look upon anyone in distress as our neighbor, is abandoned. According to the interpretation of many Church fathers since Origen and according to the liturgy, it is argued that Christ is much more our neighbor. Indeed, the context in the Gospel of Luke attests that even the Evangelist wanted the pericope understood in this sense: we are to love as our immediate neighbor Christ the Samaritan, who saved mortally wounded mankind. And out of love for Him we are to imitate Him and help other men. Thus in Christ love of God and love of neighbor coincide.

This short homily affords an example of how fruitfully the results of the *formgeschichtliche* method can be applied for practical use. It is nothing more than a return to the methods of the fathers, who considered the Evangelists more as theologians and artists than as reporters. This homily carries out in practice what K. H. Schelkle ("Über alte und neue Auslegung," *BibZeit* 1 [2, '57] 161-177) designated briefly as the way upon which modern exegesis must enter.—B. S.

63. P. WINTER, "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 217-242.

A reply to N. Turner, "The Relations of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *NTStud* 2 ('55) 100-109. In this article N. Turner had dealt with P. Winter's article, "Some observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTStud* 1 ('54) 111-121. Now W declares: The third Evangelist, it is true, was familiar with the LXX and was influenced by its style and language. But the "non-Septuagintal Hebraisms" in Luke 1 and 2 demonstrate that the Evangelist's familiarity with the Greek OT does not account for a number of Hebraisms which are especially frequent in these chapters, and that therefore the assumption of an ultimately Hebrew source offers a better explanation of the presence of these characteristics than does the current theory by which they are "secondary Hebraisms."—J. Bz.

64. P. WINTER, "‘Nazareth’ and ‘Jerusalem’ in Luke chs i and ii," *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 136-142.

The variation in the spelling of "Nazareth" in Lk 1 and 2 is such that we cannot use it as an argument in connecting the different parts of the third Gospel to its sources, especially since we are not sure of the etymological meaning. If the Hebrew word is spelled with a sadhe, it is surprising the sigma is never used in the Greek; but perhaps the change from sadhe to zain had already taken place. If the Hebrew word was *NSRT* then it would probably be from the root "to guard," and may be a reference to the geographical site of the town, overlooking the surrounding countryside. [A long footnote, largely bibliographical, discusses the derivation of "Nazorean."]

Hierusalem is much more common in Luke than *Hierosoluma*, but this does not necessarily point to a Semitic source document, as the same form is found in Acts, Paul, Heb, and the LXX. Possibly it is an "imitation Hebraism," which Luke found in some of his source documents and attempted to standardize under the impression that this was more Semitic.—L. J.

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

65. K. ALAND, "Das Johannesevangelium auf Papyrus. Zum neu veröffentlichten Papyrus Bodmer II," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* (Berlin) 31 ('57) 50-55.

A survey of previously known NT papyri and a thorough evaluation of P⁶⁶. The new papyrus "will not cause a revolution in textual criticism (but it would be a much different story if we did not already possess the Chester Beatty Papyri). Nevertheless it has an importance which has not yet been sufficiently appreciated. In the preface to his book Martin correctly observes that P⁶⁶ represents the most significant event in the field of NT scholarship since the publication of the Chester Beatty Papyri. For the new papyrus not only confirms the knowledge we have possessed these last twenty years; it also puts the discussion of the texts of John's Gospel on a very much more solid basis than heretofore."—J. Bz.

66. G. BORNKAMM, "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannes-Evangelium," *Zeit-NTWiss* 47 ('56) 161-169.

Jn 6:51-58, unlike the preceding Discourse on Bread, refers not to faith but to the Eucharist. Because of this unreconciled change of subject-matter, some have thought the verses interpolated. Against this opinion E. Ruckstuhl, in *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (1951) 243 ff., has called attention to the many typically Johannine elements of style. Characteristics of John's style, however, cannot prove conclusively the genuineness of the matter. Decisive is the fact that the subsequent passage (60-65) refers not to the Eucharistic Discourse, as many have taken for granted, but to the Discourse on Bread. The cause of the disciples' scandal was Jesus' speech about the

“descent” of the Son of Man, who both is and gives the Bread of Life; this concept, opposed as it is to “ascension,” is found in the Discourse on Bread (6:33, 38, 50 f.) but not in the Eucharistic Discourse. Since the Eucharistic Discourse is so clearly detached from what precedes and what follows, it must be the work of ecclesiastical redaction which, closely following the Gospel, has made the discourse of Jesus about the Bread of Life support the classical notion of the Lord’s Supper as represented by Ignatius.—J. Bz.

67. F.-M. BRAUN, “L’Évangile de saint Jean et l’ancienne catéchèse romaine,” *RevThom** 56 (4, ’56) 643-658.

The antiquity of the Fourth Gospel is attested in the wall paintings found in the Roman catacombs. The most frequently appearing fresco in the catacomb of Callistus is that of the Good Shepherd, a parable found only in the Gospel of John (Jn 10:1-21). The Rock of Horeb is the most frequent theme taken from the OT and is probably an allusion to Jn 7:38. In the representations of the baptism of Jesus and the sacrament, Christ and the neophyte are represented as children symbolizing a rebirth in the new life, which makes us think of the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus (Jn 3:1-21). Large baskets appear in representations of the Eucharistic banquet. In multiplying bread Jesus signified that He gave to the famished crowd spiritual food, a pledge of the future life. The relation between the miracle and the mystery, sufficiently indicated in the Synoptic accounts, is especially emphasized by John. The command of Christ, related only in John, to gather up the fragments is interpreted by the ancient authors as a behest to the apostles to guard the morsels left by the Jews and to use them to refresh the Gentiles. Rituals and writings of the period on the Eucharistic banquet also have a deep Johannine coloring.

Between 1 Pt and the writings of John, especially 1 Jn, doctrinal and even literary contacts indicate that both authors depended on a primitive catechism. John, however, has added his own personal contribution in interpreting the mysteries of the life of Christ by their biblical prefigurations and sacramental applications. One can easily imagine that after having taught from a catechism conformed to that of the *Prima Petri*, the Roman instructors enriched their lessons after the manner of the Fourth Gospel. The supposition then is not gratuitous that the cemetery paintings were intended to recall the themes of catechetical preaching and that among them a considerable part was reserved to the Gospel of John.—J. P. W.

68. J. CADIER, “The Unity of the Church,” (tr. by C. Preiss), *Interpretation* 11 (2, ’57) 166-176.

The unity for which Jesus prays in Jn 17 is based on (1) the end or purpose of the Church, which is to make manifest on earth eternal life, and thereby glorify Christ in heaven; (2) the origin of the Church which is God’s election, that is, His intention to give to His Son men who will be servants and witnesses; (3) the privilege of the Church, which is to be a flock guarded, set

apart, protected from evil; (4) the unity of the Church, which springs from its end, its origin, and its nature, and which is the supreme quality for which Jesus prayed.—L. E. I.

69. BISHOP CASSIAN, "John xxi," *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 132-136.

The external evidence for the authenticity of Jn 21 is as strong as for any other part of the book. The internal evidence against it is not decisive. And there are positive arguments in favor of it. (1) The construction is Johannine, a narrative which is the symbolic starting-point for the teaching which follows. (2) There is a close parallelism between the Fourth Gospel and Lk; Jn 21 has a striking parallel in Lk 5. (3) There are matters in the Gospel which are brought to a conclusion in chapter 21. Thus, the threefold denial of Peter in chapter 18 is rounded off by the threefold question and answer in this chapter. There is especially the connection between this chapter and chapter 10: Christ is the Good Shepherd, and in Jn 21 Peter is appointed to the pastoral office; but the ministry of Christ culminates in His death, and in Jn 21, the appointment of Peter is followed by the prophecy of his death. Further, Peter is appointed shepherd after confessing his love; and in chapter 10, the Good Shepherd's death is connected with love. Finally, Peter's death is not, as Christ's was, an atoning death, but is a "following" of Christ. This fulfills the promise of 13:36-38; the following, moreover, is in the glory that his death gives to the Father (21:19a), as Christ's death does (12:33 and 18:32). The way in which Jn 21 fits so many previous references in the Gospel may be the result of a careful adjustment by a later writer; but more probably it results from the fact that Jn 21 is part of the organic whole.—L. J.

70. I. DE LA POTTERIE, "Een nieuwe papyrus van het vierde Evangelie, Pap. Bodmer II," *Bijdragen** 18 (2, '57) 117-127. (French Summary on p. 128).

The discovery of P⁶⁶, dating from ca. A.D. 200, may be compared for its importance for NT textual criticism with the publication of the Chester Beatty Papyri. When compared P⁶⁶ is found to vary constantly from them and to take sides with the great uncials. An examination of P⁶⁶'s stand in the principal textual problems of Jn 1-14 gives the same results: P⁶⁶ has few Western or Caesarean readings and comes very near the Alexandrian text (nearer to B than to S). It follows that the Alexandrian type existed already in the second century, though with certain minor defects which were corrected later. It is significant that in some twenty cases, where the copyist of P⁶⁶ has substituted different words from those he had written at first, the deleted text belongs almost invariably to the Western tradition; evidently he knew both text-forms but preferred the Alexandrian. The high antiquity of the Alexandrian family, which seems now to be established, does not, however, give this text an absolute superiority over other contemporaneous text-forms. The B-type of this period does not seem to be the result of a veritable recension.—P. L. A.

71. C. H. DODD, "A l'arrière-plan d'un dialogue Johannique," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 5-17.

To whom does John direct the dialogue in 8:33-47? To Judaeo-Christians who believe that they do not need to be liberated, being children of Abraham. The dialogue was formed between A.D. 50 and 100. It has three main themes: liberty and servitude, the posterity of Abraham, divine filiation. The first verses (31-41) consider some local and momentary aspects of the Judaeo-Christians' quarrel. Paul refers to the same themes, although in a different way, in Gal. The second section of the dialogue touches on an essential aspect of Christianity which had been elaborated by John the Baptist and by the Evangelist: that moral conduct is but an expression of sincerity of intention (cf. Mt 3:7; 7:21). —P. E. L.

72. E. K. LEE, "St Mark and the Fourth Gospel," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 50-58.

Did John know of a tradition similar to that in Mark? Both omit the early life of Jesus, begin with the Baptist, and end with a "spiritual" resurrection. John knows facts in the Marcan tradition. There are several parallels in their accounts of the feeding of the five thousand, the anointing at Bethany, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Often these contain verbal similarities. At least sixteen other sayings or incidents related in John seem to be Marcan, e.g., Jn 9:6,7 and Mk 7:33; 8:23 (the only time *ptusas* is found in the NT). John seems to use Mark where it suits his purposes, but remolds and reinterprets him.—L. J.

73. D. MOLLAT, "Le Chapitre VI^e de Saint Jean," *LumVie** 31 ('57) 107-119.

This chapter contains in brief the essential Johannine teaching on the Eucharist. A careful study reveals the plan of the Incarnation: Christ came from heaven to give life to men; men must have faith in His person and His mission; His Eucharist is a sacrifice, a memorial of His death and a pledge of the coming of the kingdom. A close parallel is shown between the promise of manna and the murmuring of the Jews at the time of the Exodus, and the promise of the Eucharist and the murmuring of the Jews after the miraculous feeding of the crowds. The enigmas of Christ's person and promises seem to the multitude, weighed down by material preoccupations, insurmountable, and cause them to turn away. Only after the Resurrection will the difficulties be resolved through faith. The chapter concludes with a scene similar to the approaching Last Supper at which will be gathered only the Twelve, including one who has a devil. The nature of the life which His flesh shall give will be explained after the Last Supper. From this chapter the mystery of the Eucharist stands forth as being at the very core of the theology of St. John. —J. E. O'C.

74. R. MORGAN, "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel," *Interpretation* 11 (2, '57) 155-165.

The foundation of the Fourth Gospel is in the OT. This can be seen in the use of the framework of Jewish feasts, in the presence of the OT at every crucial moment in the Gospel, in the Messiah repeatedly manifesting Himself where Hebrew history and hope are most evident, in the redemption being presented as a second Exodus, and in the Logos of the prologue with its OT foundations. The Fourth Gospel also fulfills the OT by recapitulation. This is clear from the presentation of Jesus as the true Israel, as the Lamb of God, and as the Logos of God. These relationships between the OT and the NT show the basic unity of the two Testaments. Through this unity each Testament casts light on the other.—J. A. B.

75. G. QUISPEL, "Het Johannesevangelie en de Gnosis," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 11 ('56-'57) 173-203.

The problem of the relationship between the Johannine writings and Gnosticism has undergone a considerable change of perspective during the last years. The Qumran documents have revealed the pre-Gnostic Jewish background of John. But the picture they give us of it is far from complete. The Nag Hammadi *Gospel of Truth* helps us to fill up some gaps, especially as regards Christology; for second-century Gnosticism, apart from the Hellenistic and other influences it has undergone, has strong roots in esoteric Judaism. The *Gospel of Truth* contains characteristic speculations on the divine Name which the Father has entrusted to the Son, who is himself called "the Name." The Son is the only being generated by God, and He in turn created the Aeons so as to be their Lord (pp. 38 #25—39 #2). Him the Father sent out into the universe in order that He might reveal Him (pp. 40 #23—41 #3; 23 #33—24 #5). Similar conceptions are found in the *First Book of Yeou* (W. Till, *Kopt.-Gnost. Schriften* I [Griech. chr. Schriftst.], Berlin ²1954, pp. 257-302; especially ch. 5 and 41). Now these conceptions bear a distinctly Jewish cachet. In later Jewish mystical writings, such as those studied by H. Oderberg (*3 Enoch*, Cambridge, 1928) and G. Schölem (*Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*², New York, 1946), appear speculations on the Angel of the Lord (later called Metatron) in whom is the Name of the Lord (Exod 23:21), who is the bearer of all the divine attributes, and whom God sends out in order to guide man before the throne of God. Elsewhere speculations center around the *dēmuth kēmar'eh 'adam* which appears on the heavenly throne in Ezek 1:26; this appearance is said to be the Creator of the world and is further described with the features of the bridegroom of Cant 5:11. These conceptions are not without relevance for the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel; there are good reasons to believe that they were substantially pre-Christian in origin. According to Scharastāni and Al Qirqisānī, the pre-Christian Jewish sect of the "Magharians" held very similar ideas. So it cannot be said that John put into the mouth of the Baptist Christological views incompatible with Jewish ideas of the time (cf. Jn 1:34;

3:29,31,34). We may now safely assume, that where our Lord appears in the Fourth Gospel as the bearer and revealer of God's own Name, or even as identical with that Name (cf. 12:23,28; 17:5; 3 Jn 7; and especially the *ego eimi* sayings), the Evangelist shows acquaintance with the same esoteric Jewish currents of thought which underlie later Gnostic speculations on the Name. In the same light may be viewed the Prologue's doctrine of the Logos, to whom the creation and all the divine interventions in history are ascribed (cf. also 12:41; 8:58; 1:51): Logos = *memra* is only a respectful designation of the unspeakable Name. The conclusion is that John's doctrine of the divinity of the man Jesus was by no means a falsification of the original Palestinian kerygma; and the later Church's dogma only translated into Greek what he had said in scriptural language.—P. L. A.

76. G. QUISPEL, "Nathanael und der Menschensohn (Joh 1, 51)," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 281-283.

Justin (*Dial.* 58,11; 86,2) understood Gen 28:12 to mean that it was not God but Christ whom Jacob saw at the head of the ladder. Likewise for Jn 1:51 one can presuppose that Nathanael with others will see Christ in His heavenly glory. It is generally recognized that Jn 12:41 contains an allusion to Isa 6:1, a verse which in the circles in which the Merkabah mysticism (*Merkabahmystik*) originated, was referred not to God but to His revelation (*Offenbarungsgestalt*), His *kabod*. Thence one can conclude that in Jn 12:41 and also in 1:51 there is thought of a vision of Christ on the heavenly throne. Behind the *anabainein kai katabainein* probably lies the Hebrew *yarad* in its technical meaning, which it had also in the Merkabah mysticism, where it was used for the *ascent* into the world of glory (*Thronwelt*), although it meant *descent*. "The angels therefore ascended to the Son of man and descended upon Nathanael, the Israelite in the true sense of the word, in whom, unlike Jacob of old, there is no guile."—J. Bz.

77. J. RACETTE, "L'unité du discours sur le pain de vie (Jean, VI)," *Scienc-Eccl** 9 (1, '57) 82-85.

The close connection of question and answer, the constancy of major themes recurring in the same order and explained progressively prove without doubt that the whole discourse is about the Eucharist.—P. L.

78. E. M. SIDEBOTTOM, "The Ascent and Descent of the Son of Man in the Gospel of St. John," *AnglTheolRev* 2 (2, '57) 115-122.

The expression "Son of Man" in the Fourth Gospel carries several connotations not found in the Synoptics. For example, the Son of Man alone ascended and descended (3:13, cf. 6:62). The notion of a descending Son of Man departs from the "one like unto a son of man" of Jewish apocalypses, who is never said to descend, as well as from the mediators and the descent-ascent motif in Hellenistic thought and myth. Jn 3:13 does not insist on the idea of ascent and descent

in itself. The point is that Jesus the Son of Man alone is heavenly by origin. No one has ascended, no one has seen the Father. But the Son of Man, being already in the bosom of the Father, has come down to reveal Him. Even granted the possibility of a stress on the idea of ascent in 3:13, it is certain in any case that this would refer to Christ's literal Ascension, not to a mystical ascent like that of the Gnostic messengers of the soul, who, to save their followers from the thrall of matter, lead them out of the world.—B. F. M.

79. L. SMEREKA, "Ecce Mater Tua," *Ruch Biblijny I Liturgiczny** (De Actione Biblica et Liturgica) 9 ('56) 244-261.

Origen first saw a spiritual meaning in Jn 19:26; Rupert of Deutz followed him, and Denis the Carthusian explicitly wrote: "The beloved disciple represents each of the faithful. By saying 'Behold thy Mother,' Jesus has given her as a mother to each and every Christian." The same doctrine was taught by Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, who in turn was the disciple of St. John. God in His providence permitted the presence of the Blessed Virgin at the foot of the cross not in order that soldiers could torture her spiritually, as J. Pickl in *Messiaskoenig Jesus* (Munich, 1939) suggests, and not in order that by commending her to St. John Jesus could break His natural bonds with her and thus complete His sacrifice, as J. Belzer in *Das Evangelium des hl. Johannes* (Freiburg, 1905) explains; but in order that Jesus could give us Mary as our mother in the supernatural order.—J. C. J.

80. R. T. STAMM, "The Preacher, the Scholar, and the Gospel of John," *Interpretation* 11 (2, '57) 131-154.

Biblical revelation is essentially contingent upon particular circumstances. It further undergoes legitimate evolutionary development measured in terms of each one's experience enlightened by scientific and other discoveries. Thus the kingdom is not merely eschatological but also a living reality, vitalized in each one's participation in Jesus' prerogatives (e.g. forgiving sin). The kingdom in but not of this world stems from a realization of the "perpetual presence of Jesus," a key idea in John's Gospel.—M. E. C.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

81. G. S. DUNCAN, "Paul's Ministry in Asia—the Last Phase," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 211-218.

The sources for this inquiry are the relevant passage of Acts, 1 and 2 Cor, the Captivity Epistles (accepted as dating from the Ephesian period), and the Pastoral Epistles (accepted as largely genuine and dating from the same period). Much of the evidence may be said to be hypothetical, but progress is through constructive hypotheses. There are certain key points in the reconstruction of the period: (1) the imprisonment during which Phlm and perhaps Col and Eph were written, (2) the painful visit to Corinth, (3) the visit to Colossae,

(4) the "trial" in Asia (2 Cor 1:8 ff.), (5) the crisis referred to in 2 Tm 4, (6) the painful letter to Corinth, (7) the riot of the silversmiths at Ephesus. After his first imprisonment, Paul pays a quick visit to Corinth, then returns to Asia, visiting Colossae and meeting with some great trial. He returns to Ephesus from where, possibly, he writes to the Corinthians again before setting out to visit them, driven from Ephesus by the riot. The trial referred to in 2 Cor 1:8 ff. and 2 Tm 4 is probably one of the occasions on which he suffered "thirty-nine stripes" at the hands of a Jewish court, a climax in Jewish hostility which brought Paul to the verge of death.

Such a reconstruction allows us to account for the movements of Timothy, Tychicus, Mark, Erastus, and Titus. In the spring or early summer of 55, Titus came to give a report on conditions at Corinth, a report which was followed by Paul's painful visit. He was then sent to Dalmatia (he was still away when Paul wrote 2 Tm 4) but returned to Asia to rejoin Paul and report on his mission. Titus was then sent to Corinth with the painful Epistle; he returned to Paul waiting for news at Troas, took back from him 2 Cor. Paul meanwhile went to Dyrrachium before going on to Corinth for his last, three-month visit. The objections of P. N. Harrison (*NTStud* 2 [2, '57]), leave this position unmoved; the unity of 2 Tm is not a necessary part of the thesis. Would Paul have sent off all his lieutenants if a critical trial in Rome were imminent? The objection to the Ephesian origin of Phil, namely, that it does not mention the collections which Timothy and Erastus initiated during their visit, is wholly unjustified.—L. J.

82. J. DUPONT,* "*Laos ex Ethnon*," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 47-50.

In James's discourse in Acts 15 the quotation from Amos (Acts 15:16-18) fits the context only if the LXX is used. J. N. Sanders has suggested that the quotation, which is easily detachable from the discourse, is a Lucan addition to an earlier account. V. 14, however, also depends on the Greek. Its biblical style is striking and echoes Deut 14:2; 7:6; Exod 19:5; 23:22 (LXX). It is not an exact quotation, but examination shows it highly probable that a biblical formula was intended. Thus v. 14 presents the same problem as vv. 16-18, and a satisfactory solution must account for the use of the Greek Bible in both.—L. J.

83. J. DUPONT, "Pierre et Paul dans les Actes," *RevBib** 64 (1, '57) 35-47.

Determination of the relationships between Peter and Paul up to A.D. 50 is complicated by seemingly profound differences in the prime sources, Gal and Acts. Among numerous attempted reconciliations can be detected a widespread trend toward solving an exegetical question less by analysis of texts than by imaginative, if ingenious, reconstructions based on logical and psychological probabilities. One example is J. N. Sanders, "Peter and Paul in the Acts," *NTStud* 2 (1955) 133-143, here summarized and criticized.

Paul's version S accepts throughout. Acts, several times inexact, does not adhere to chronological sequence. Paul's visits to Jerusalem present a key

problem. His first, incorrectly given by Luke as official, was private, three years after his conversion in 31 (a date 5 or 6 years too early for D). His second visit, in 43/4, occasioned a conference with the three pillars of the Church. Acts errs by relating it with the famine or with aid brought by Paul much later. A third visit Acts connects with the apostolic council, while Paul was on his second mission journey, on which he started after the dispute with Peter at Antioch. Only after the third voyage did he again approach Jerusalem. D discovers S's solution pivoting on Paul's second visit, dated before the Pasch of 44. But every reason advanced for this date is open to objection. It involves acceptance of a suspect, Western reading of Gal 2:9, which names Peter first among the three pillars. James, there inserted between Peter and John (D prefers him first), is held to be the brother of John; but the immediate context demands that he be the brother of the Lord. With S's doubt that the latter was then a pillar, D disagrees. He further denies that S's whole structure rises from any firmer hypotheses.—J. F. Bk.

84. J. HAMAIDE AND P. GUILBERT, "Résonances pastorales du plan des Actes des Apôtres," *ÉglViv** 9 (2, '57) 95-113.

A scrutiny of Acts reveals that the author planned to set forth the expansion of the Church in three stages: in Jerusalem, in Palestine, in the entire world. Luke's aim was to show an internal necessity for the expansion of Christianity beyond the limits of Judaism. Thus the absence of a more definite chronology, the historical presentation of this growth in particular tableaux or "cycles" centered about a person or event, and the pastoral activity of the Apostles, all acquire significance in the light of this universal aim. From the first general division of the book (1:1-15:29) certain pastoral conclusions can be drawn. The tableaux are presented to give a full view of the Church, a description of the Christian community in its growth. Conversions, persecutions, and miracles are all essential to the expansion of the Church. They present to the world the miraculous paradox of unity amidst full catholicity. True missionary activity will construct the temporal reality of this internal missionary impulse of the Christian community which looks forward to and will attain its fullness at the parousia.—R. B. C.

85. P.-H. MENOUD, "Les additions au groupe des douze apôtres, d'après le livre des Actes," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 71-80.

In Acts the title of apostle is reserved to the Twelve. Even Paul is denied it. Judas is replaced, but not James the martyr. What conception (or conceptions) of apostleship lies behind these apparently conflicting facts? Starting from Acts 1: 15-26 with its textual difficulties, Ch. Masson answers: Luke adapted an ancient source to his own conception of apostleship and to the new state of the Church where, pagan-born members being now the majority, a lack of interest in the Twelve was observed. But from the pericope and the quotations made in v. 20, one may conclude: (1) Luke is the author of the entire passage; (2) the prestige of the Twelve was still high; (3) an apostle

is replaced, not when he dies, but when he betrays, for, in addition to his function in the present, he is endowed with an eschatological mission. This last consists of judging the twelve tribes of Israel in the kingdom of God. Such was not Paul's mission and James was no traitor.—J. P. C.

86. J. SCHWARTZ, "A propos du statut personnel de l'apôtre Paul," *RevHist-PhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 91-96.

Contrary to the Greek text of Acts 21:39, St. Jerome and the Venerable Bede do not speak of Paul as a *citizen* of Tarsus. Moreover, the question of citizenship in Acts 21:39 has no real foundation. It is not probable that the word *polites* is a late addition, but one of the first editors of Acts, a Jew or a Judaeo-Christian from Alexandria, might have thought that his co-religionists retained in the other Greek cities the citizenship of their native town.—P. E. L.

87. W. C. VAN UNNIK, "Der Befehl an Philippus," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 181-191.

The angel's command (Acts 8:26-27a) is doubly curious: first, in that Philip is instructed to set out "at midday," when most people would be resting rather than on the road; secondly, in that he is told to look for a caravan route which is described as "deserted," and on which a preacher of the gospel would have little to do. Moreover, one finds odd the repetition of the angel's first words in the confirmatory verse 27: *kai anastas eporeuthe*, as well as the phrase *kai idou* following, used to introduce a surprising event. A comparison with some OT passages, especially with Jon 1:1-3 and 3:1-3, indicates what Luke intends to tell us here; he wants to lay emphasis on the fact that Philip, the preacher of the gospel, is obedient although he has received an *absurd command*. The theme of the "absurd command" is also found in Acts 5:20, 20:22-23, 21:4-11 ff., 10:13 ff.; the theme of "obedience or opposition to the guidance of God" in 4:19-20, 5:29, 5:32-33, 5:39, 7:51, 13:45, 28:24, and 29:19.—J. Bz.

EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

88. O. BAUERNFEIND, "Die Begegnung zwischen Paulus und Kephas, Gal 1:18-20," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 268-276.

The passage containing the three verses Gal 1:18-20 should logically begin with v.10 rather than with v.11. The Galatian adversaries of Paul ascribe his unduly liberal attitude toward the Gentile Christians to his eagerness for pleasing men. Their criticism would run something like this: "Paul is afraid of losing his large congregations and many converts, if it becomes known that real faith in Christ leads to real observance of the Law. For that reason he hides from Gentiles who are prospective converts the seriousness of observing the Law. Gaining the favor of men and nothing else is Paul's concern, as he proved also even at the time when he wanted to join forces (*Anschluss*) with the older apostles." For his part Paul does not dignify with a single word the

first reproach, i.e., the insult to his missionary methods; the simple, truthful presentation of his actual conduct towards the older apostles will suffice to settle the matter completely. A man who demonstrably did not curry the favor of the apostles at Jerusalem will surely not curry the favor of other men.—J. Bz.

89. M.-F. BERROUARD, "Le Mérite dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul," *Istina** 3 ('56) 313-332.

The concepts of judgment and retribution were an essential axis of Paul's Jewish background; he was the irreproachable Jew. His vision changed as a convert; he saw the need of salvation by grace, not by works of the Law (Gal 2:15-16; 1:15; 1 Tim 1:12-16). The continual help of grace explained miracles and conversions; it was a free gift of God that made Paul's inherent weakness strong through an interior burning (1 Cor 2:4-5; 2 Cor 4:7-12; Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 4:6-7; 12:7-10). Man must put all his forces at the service of this power of God which is the principle of merit (1 Cor 15:9-10). Grace gives him the strength to labor and sacrifice; it is left to his liberty not to oppose grace, but to manifest docile receptivity to its lights in action. The apostolate is a collaboration with God who is the first cause of all, but His love wishes man's cooperation (1 Cor 4:15; 3:5-10; 2 Cor 6:1; 11:2; 3:2-3).

Paul rejoices in his successful mission to the pagans, accomplished through God's grace and through his own labors (2 Cor 10:13-16; Rom 15:17-20). He is proud of his work, but as an instrument of God (1 Thes 2:7-9; 2 Thes 3:7-9; 1 Cor 9:11-15; 2 Cor 11:10-12; Gal 2:11-14). He makes no special claims because of his ministry, but he glories in his collaboration with grace (2 Cor 3:5-6; 1 Cor 4:4; 2 Cor 1:12). No one apostle is to be singled out as the evangelizer, but each will be given his due reward according to his effort (1 Cor 3:3-17); God will be the judge of that. The work of forming a Christian community is like constructing a building. Each worker has a task and will receive a salary according to his following of specifications. The apostles are slaves of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God. They seek not partisans but strive to be faithful to their master and his message. If they do that God will one day praise them (1 Cor 4:1-5; 2 Tim 4:6-8). Paul himself expects a crown due in justice for his work which is meritorious (2 Cor 4:6-8). The hope of this reward is a spur to his generosity in labor (1 Cor 15:29-32; 2 Cor 4:17, 14, 16; 1 Tim 4:10). He is full of assurance and would prefer its prompt fulfillment (2 Cor 5:2-8; Phil 1:21-23; 3:13-14; 1 Tim 4:10). The churches for which he has labored will be his glory on the day of judgment; that is why he is so concerned for their orthodoxy (1 Thes 2:19-20; 2 Cor 1:14; Phil 2:16). His whole life shows his belief in the existence of merit.—J. L. M.

90. M. E. BOISMARD, "L'Eucharistie selon Saint Paul," *LumVie** 31 (Feb. '57) 93-106.

Three points are studied: (1) the institution of the Last Supper, (2) Paul's theological concept of the Eucharist, (3) the value of Paul's testimony. The

actual words of consecration must be interpreted in context, wherein it is clear that Paul intends no new teaching but that which he received, which was consistent with the primitive Christian catechesis. Paul understood Christ's words in a very realistic sense, for improper reception of the Eucharist bears with it the guilt and punishment of sacrilege. The Eucharist is truly the Body of Christ and is truly a sacrifice by means of which the faithful enter into communion with God and His vivifying Spirit. Paul did not give a new teaching but reaffirms the teaching which he had been given and which he himself gave earlier. Some have overlooked the fact that the Eucharistic ritual is Jewish, not Hellenistic, in origin. The dependence of Mark upon Paul in this matter is refuted.—J. E. O'C.

91. M. BRUNEC, "De 'Homine Peccati' in 2 Thes 2:1-12," *VerbDom** 35 (1, '57) 3-33.

The "man of sin" is to be identified not with the eschatological Antichrist, but with an adversary of Christianity already present and active in St. Paul's time; namely, unbelieving pharisaic Judaism. The title "man of sin" should be interpreted not from secular history but from the Bible; it means *the* (well known) adversary, marked down for perdition, in constant opposition to God and to the Roman Emperor (= *sebasma*), i.e. the Jews. The "lawless one" (a collective expression) of v.8 will be revealed when the pharisaic *Sicarii* desecrate the Temple by pitching camp there at the beginning of the Jewish War. What is "restraining" God's anger (v.6) is the Church still present in Jerusalem. The *apostasia* (v.3) is to be understood materially of the departure of the Church from Jerusalem at the beginning of the War. The "abomination of desolation" spoken of in the Synoptic eschatological discourses and in Daniel likewise refers to the desecration of the Temple by the *Sicarii*.—J. F. B.

92. J. COURTS, "Ephesians i.3-14 and I Peter i.3-12," *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 115-127.

Behind these two passages lie forms of liturgical prayer connected with baptism. The passages are a homily on the prayer. [The author appears to be almost entirely concerned with Eph; 1 Pt forms mainly a basis of comparison.] The passage of Eph falls into three sections, marked by the concluding stereotyped formula *eis epainon doxes*. To this threefold structure corresponds the Trinitarian thought of the passage. There are traces, too, in the grammatical structure which suggest that there was an original stereotyped series of formulas, disturbed by the present form. 1 Pt begins with the same phrase, a well-attested liturgical formula. There are reminiscences of other formulas from Eph (e.g., *eis epainon kai doxan kai timen*). There is the same Trinitarian structure. In 1 Pt, however, it is less obvious; and in particular the section dealing with the Son is more concerned with the conscious response of Christians to the Son's action. This suggests the hypothesis that a liturgical prayer has been made the subject of a homily; in 1 Pt the change from prayer

to exhortation occurs earlier than in Eph, resulting in greater confusion of the underlying prayer.

The attempt to reconstruct the prayer is rash and the result can only be tentative. The method to be used is: (1) to omit phrases which seem to be the author's own comment; (2) where equivalent phrases are set side by side, to omit the more Pauline, as probably representing the author's own paraphrase of the prayer-phrase; (3) to make such changes as are necessary to restore the uniform structure and formulae which presumably existed in the original. The result is the following suggestion [translated from the author's Greek]:

Blessed art Thou, God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ,
who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heaven in Christ,
who has chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world,
who has destined us for sonship through Jesus Christ,
According to the pleasure of His will, for the praise of His glory;
According to the favor He has bestowed on us in the Beloved
in whom we have remission of sins,
in whom we expect deliverance through His blood,
in whom we have gained our inheritance;
According to the pleasure of His will, for the praise of His glory;
In the Holy Spirit, in whom
we have heard the gospel of salvation,
we have believed the word of truth,
we have been sealed as a possession redeemed,
According to the pleasure of His will, for the praise of His glory.

That this formula was connected with baptism is suggested by many phrases in the passage itself: "the Beloved" of v.6, recalling "This is my beloved Son" at Christ's Baptism; the "sealing"; the reference to predestination to sonship. The connection with baptism is also suggested (1) by the main theme of the following section, that the Christian shares in the death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ; (2) by the main theme of the section after that (2:11 ff.), unity; and (3) by the ethical teaching of the last section (5:22-6:9).—L. J.

93. L. DELEKAT, "Die Syropalästinische Übersetzung der Paulusbrieve und die Peschitta," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 223-233.

Examples show that the Syropalestinian version (Sp) of the Pauline corpus is not independent of the Peshitto (S). But these examples do not show where the dependence lies. It has now been shown that Sp is not as late as used to be thought. Moreover, the style of Sp, clear and accurate, is closer to the Greek than is S. A further series of examples tends to show that S depends on Sp. It is possible that Sp depends on a West-Aramaic translation brought from Antioch to Edessa and may in fact be identical with it, and that this is the source of S.—L. J.

94. A. M. DENIS, "L'Apôtre Paul, prophète 'messianique' des Gentils," *Eph-TheolLouv** (2, '57) 245-318.

A thematic study of 1 Thes 2:1-6 reveals that Paul considers himself to be accomplishing what Isaiah describes in the Servant Songs: the eschatological consummation of the OT and its expectations. An accumulation of OT terms shows Paul is in the line of the prophets, but is a prophet of the new era. His mission is to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, accomplishing with the Messiah what the other prophets had foretold. For his hearers he inaugurates the new era and introduces them into it. His high prophetic mission is due to his choice by God. The word indicating this choice is from Jeremiah, but it contains a meaning not found in the OT and is perhaps borrowed from the language of the imperial decrees.—V. O'K.

95. A.-M. DUBARLE, "Le péché originel dans la Genèse," *RevBib** 64 (1, '57) 5-34.

The most important text concerning original sin is evidently the account of the Fall in Genesis. St. Paul refers to it when he speaks of sin and the entrance of death into the world by a single man, Adam (Rom 5:12-19; 1 Cor 15:22). To understand this well-known page of Gen, it is necessary to keep in view the over-all intent of the book. An examination of it enables one to conclude that even before St. Paul, Scripture treats of original sin in the light of salvation which delivers from it.—J. P. W.

96. E. E. ELLIS, "A Note on First Corinthians 10:4," *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 53-56.

The Pauline phrase in the Exodus typology of 1 Cor 10:1 ff. which speaks of a spiritual rock which followed the Israelites in the desert and identifies this rock with Christ, has been related in varying degrees to a cumulative legend in rabbinic literature. The legend concerns a movable well given to the Israelites in the desert and is traceable to a Targumic interpretation of Num 21:17. While common points in the 1 Cor text and the legend make some relation probable, several references in Isa and Ps to water from a rock suggest that Paul and the Targum are more directly related to a particular interpretation of certain Exod and Num passages by the prophets than they are to each other.—E. F. M.

97. A. FEUILLET, "Le Mystère Pascal et la Résurrection des chrétiens d'après les Épîtres pauliniennes," *NouvRevThéol** 79 (4, '57) 337-354.

In the theology of Paul, the Resurrection of Christ is the decisive eschatological event in the history of salvation. His view of eschatology, unlike that of the OT, is that the eschatological events have already occurred, and that two opposite worlds are temporarily coexisting. Christ's Resurrection is the beginning of a new humanity risen with Christ. The resurrection of Christians is a complex fact, in which may be distinguished three modes of realization. The

first is baptism, which Paul, in numerous passages, correlates with the Resurrection of Christ. The second is Christian life considered as a continuous death and resurrection with Christ, particularly through the sacraments. The third is the bodily resurrection of Christians at the end of time. In the light of this doctrine, 1 Cor 15 takes on new significance. Man's future resurrection should never be considered merely as a final state of existence, but should be viewed in the eschatological context of Paul's Epistles.—F. V.

98. G. Gander, "I Cor. 10:2 parle-t-il du baptême?" *RevHistPhilRel* 37 ('57) 97-102.

There is really no mention of baptism in 1 Cor 10:2. Hence a correction based on the Aramaic text is required. The triconsonantal Aramaic word in question could be translated by "to baptize" or "to go across," according to the position of a dot *above* or *in* the third consonant ('*mad*, '*mar*'). Thus Paul might have written the first copy of 1 Cor 10 in Aramaic, and his secretary may have falsified his thought. The exact translation closer to the context would then be: "under the guidance of Moses they have all passed through the mist and the sea," instead of: "they have all received baptism from Moses, in the mist and the sea." In 1 Cor 10:2 we have another indication that the original text of the NT was predominantly not Greek but Aramaic.—P. E. L.

99. K. HEUSSI, "Petrus und die beiden Jakobus in Galater 1-2," *Wissenschaftlich. Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität (Jena)* 6 ('56/57) 147-152.

A refutation of K. Aland, "Wann starb Petrus?" (*NTStud* 2 ('56) 267-275). H proposes and attempts to prove these four theses: (1) it is improbable that Peter was still alive in A.D. 55/56; (2) it can be proved that the James of Gal 2:9 is not the "Brother of the Lord"; (3) *ēsan* in Gal 2:6 cannot possibly refer to the time of the Council of Jerusalem; (4) it is probable that all three (Peter, James, and John) had died before 55/56.—J. Bz.

100. W. KOESTER, "Platonische Ideenwelt und Gnosis im Hebräerbrief," *Scholastik** 4 ('56) 545-555.

F. J. Schierse, S.J. (*Verheissung und Heilsvollendung; Zur theologischen Grundfrage des Hebräerbriefes*, Münchener theol. Studien 1; hist. Abt. 9 [München: Zink, 1955, DM 21], xvi & 219 pp.) seeks to explain the main ideas of Heb by Plato's and Philo's distinction between *kosmos aisthetos* and *noetos*. Already in the OT the earthly tabernacle was only the place where God appeared and a copy of the preexistent tabernacle in heaven (1 Chr 29:19; Wis 9:8). *Aion* is present or future in Jewish writings, the Gospels, Paul, and John, but in Heb it never means time or space of this world, but, like the *me phainomena* and the *ou blepomena*, is the same as the heavenly city (11:10, 16). And from these ideals (prototypes) the visible things proceed as perishable copies (11:3). Moreover the *oikoumene* (1:6) signifies the future world into

which Christ is introduced as first-born, the first to be raised from the dead and to be exalted. This *oikoumene* is the future world of "the Man" (2:4): "all" are the Redeemer and His brethren, the heavenly *ecclesia* of sons of God. Similarly the "house of God" (3:1-6) is the eschatological family of God. And the "rest" (3:11), the heavenly "native country" and the "heavenly city" (ch. 11), are the blessings of the other world. But the heavenly tabernacle is not to be conceived as a room with a certain arrangement, but it is rather the nearness of God. Even now the community (*ecclesia*) possesses authorization (*parrhesia*) for entrance into the sanctuary (10:19; 12:28) during its liturgical worship, especially that of the Eucharist: for the cross, the Last Supper, and the heavenly sanctuary are conceived as a unity together with the altar (13:10).

As for the body of Christ, it is *eikon*, the ideal body and a preview (*Vorausdarstellung*) of the heavenly prototype, the curtain of the heavenly sanctuary (10:20), and consequently the victim once sacrificed who has perfected forever those who are sanctified. The risen body is a "new creation" (12:27), a "real" body, for all the prototypes according to Plato are more real than the phenomena. Thus Plato's way of thinking helps us to understand especially the absolute supernaturality of the redemption and the sharp contrast between Christianity and materialism against which Heb gives four threatening warnings (2:2 ff.; 3:12 ff.; 6:4-8; 10:26; 12:12 ff.). Man's fundamental desires will be satisfied only in the heavenly world. Concerning the concepts of ch. 2: the misery of fallen humanity, the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus, the unity of the Redeemer and the redeemed, these S believes are presented according to the pattern of the Gnostic myth which, for the most part, he understands as does J. Jonas. But the differences between the Gnostic myth and Heb are very great: in the former the souls, once preexistent, are now imprisoned in evil matter; when called from above they become aware of their preexistence in the light and are redeemed. Difficult as it is for us to enter into the mind of Plato and the thinkers of Alexandria, the process is, however, very valuable for the understanding of Heb.—W. Ks. (Author).

101. J. LEAL, "Super virgine sua (1 Cor 7:37)," *VerbDom** 35 (2, '57) 97-102.

Paul is giving advice not to a father who wonders whether to give his daughter in marriage or keep her a virgin, but to a young man who is in doubt whether to contract marriage with a virgin who for some special reason (unknown to us) is "his own." The language of v. 36 is veiled and euphemistic: "If anyone thinks to do that which is unseemly in regard to his virgin—supposing that he is in full vigour (*hyperakmos*)—and so it must be done, then let him do that which he wishes. He does not sin. Let them marry."—J. F. Bl.

102. E. LOHSE, "Zu I Cor 10, 26, 31," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 277-280.

For the foundation of the obligation binding on every Jew to pronounce a blessing over all food the Tosefta (*Berakoth* IV:1) cites Ps 24:1. Because the earth is the Lord's, and the abundance thereof, it follows that anyone who omits

the blessing before eating something, commits a wanton offense against God's property. This basis for the custom of blessing at meals must have been known in St. Paul's time. 1 Cor 10:26 seems to imply as much, because first, Ps 24:1 appears here also in connection with some questions about conduct at table, and secondly, the bidding in 1 Cor 10:31, "do everything for the glory of God," has a parallel in the instructions of the Tosefta. Paul therefore used ideas which originated in Jewish precepts for conduct at meals. Yet he does not employ these precepts in an exact legalistic sense. He views them only from the standpoint of those who deny the existence of false gods and who eat any food with a tranquil conscience.—J. Bz.

103. S. LYONNET, "Notes sur l'exégèse de l'Épître aux Romains," *Biblica** 38 (1, '57) 35-61.

L deals with (1) the literary structure of Rom 1:22-32 and (2) the sense of *paresis* in Rom 3:25. In (1) he upholds the traditional division, 24f.; 26f.; 28-32, against Klostermann who cuts off v.32 and transposes vv.22f. from the preceding section to the following one. As regards (2) the ancient versions and the interpreters down to the seventeenth century have unanimously translated "forgiveness"; but since the eighteenth century the meaning "tolerance" has become common. In recent years interpreters have reverted to the older meaning making *paresis* a synonym of *aphesis*. This interpretation is supported by the notion of the justice of God in Rom 3:25 and by the meaning of *paresis*. The justice of God manifested through the sacrifice of Christ is His saving activity. Before the coming of Christ God seemed to take no notice of sin. This, however, means only that God put off the destruction of sin to a later time, to the sacrifice of Christ. Therefore the saving activity of God consists essentially in the deliverance of man from the bondage of sin and in the bestowal upon him of the benefits promised by God. Consequently God's apparent indifference to sin must be taken in the sense of a delay of God's demand of reparation, not in the sense of sins left unpunished.

The word *paresis* is an *hapax* in the NT. It does not occur in the LXX. In Hellenistic Greek it means "paralysis, languor," and "remission of debt, tax, penalty"; it never means "negligence in punishing a fault," though the verb *parienai* sometimes means "to omit" (Lk 11:42). Therefore the expression *dia ten paresin* in Rom 3:25 may mean "by means of the forgiveness (of sins)." Other interpreters distinguish between *paresis* and *aphesis*. Paul has made use of such a rare word as *paresis* instead of the more common *aphesis* to denote something different from forgiveness. The sense is that God has left sins unforgiven, not unpunished. Others give the word *paresis* the meaning of a provisional forgiveness leading to the real forgiveness of NT times. The *paresis* of OT times is an initial pardon accorded by God to the sins of Israel before the real pardon which was to be granted by Christ to Jews and Gentiles.—P. P. S.

104. P. B. MARIANI, "S. Paolo e il Serve di Jahwe," *RivistBib** 4 ('56) 330-356; 5 ('57) 17-24.

Christian tradition applied the Servant Songs, Is 40-53, to Jesus; in Acts and in the Epistles of Paul they are applied to Paul himself. It is important to define exactly in what sense this application is made. Paul is called to illumine the Gentiles: Acts 13:47 (Is 49:6, LXX); 18:9-10 (Is 41:10, LXX); 26:16-18 (Is 42:7); and to suffer: 9:15-16 (Is 53). These texts are either verbal quotations or adaptations or only echoes of the Songs. It is clear however that Luke, in any case, is identifying the work of the Servant with that of Paul. The Apostle himself is familiar with Is 49:52;53. He was called from his mother's womb to preach: Gal 1:15 (Is 49:1,6,LXX). The Corinthians must accept his word, for his behavior in no way stood in the way: 2 Cor 6:2 (Is 49:8). There are allusions to Is 49:4 in Phil 2:16; Gal 2; 2 Cor 6:11. In 2 Cor 4:6 one finds a reference to Is 9:2, 49:6, 9 and in Phil 2:10 to Is 45:23; so also Rom 14:11 to Is 49. Rom 15:20 is an interpretation or adaption of Is 52:15 LXX. The obstinacy of the Jews had already been foretold in Is 53:1. Hence Luke refers to Is whenever he is relating a decisive incident in Paul's career: his conversion, his work in Antioch and Corinth, his *apologia* before Agrippa. Paul himself is convinced of the identical nature of his own and the Servant of Yahweh's mission to preach and to suffer. He does not substitute himself for Christ. Jesus remains the Servant and the Apostle his collaborator. The other apostles are not excluded, but Paul's share is a special one.—C. S.

105. H. P. OWEN, "The 'Stages of Ascent' in Hebrews v.11-vi.3," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 243-253.

At this crucial point of the argument of Heb, the author divides the Christian life into stages. How many stages? Two, it is often suggested. But an analysis of the context and comparison with the philosophical *paideia* advocated by Philo and the Stoics suggests three. The first stage is that of "childhood" in which the believer needs instruction in first principles. The second is that of ethical perfection, in which, by practice, the believer acquires a reasoned pattern of behavior. The mature believer is then able to pass to the third stage of taking solid food, i.e., the doctrine of Christ's High-Priesthood. Such a threefold stage is taught by Philo, and the first two are given in Epictetus (the illumination of a moral life being the "solid food," since for him practical reason is the highest faculty).

The author of Hebrews omits the first two stages and proceeds at once to the third stage with the most unexpected connective "therefore." He omits the first because it consisted of arid formulae, and the community is already sluggish enough. He omits the second because this moral *ascesis* takes time, and the end is already near. By leaping immediately to the third stage, he hopes to shake them out of their lethargy. Moreover, this third stage subsumes the others. It provides spiritual maturity by sharing in Christ's perfection instead of by a long process of self-training. His *logos parakleseos* replaces both the *logos tes arches* and the *logos dikaiousunes*.

Comparing this with Philo and Epictetus, we see that it resembles Philo in the threefold scheme, and the Stoics in the catechetical quality of the formulation of the first stage, but it differs from both in its willingness to drop the preparatory stages in favor of the last. Moreover, the author of Heb avoids Gnostic terms such as *sophia*. The object of his teaching is not a "mystery"; it is difficult only because of the dullness of the community and is not reserved to special members but is for all. It does not involve, as Philo's does, a flight from time, but makes an appeal to Christ in whom the end has become present; this eschatological quality also modifies the preceding stages. The confession which the community has already made is now essentially "a confession of hope."—L. J.

106. W. SCHMITHALS, "Die Häretiker in Galatien," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 25-67.

Commentaries and introductions agree in holding that the heretics in Galatia were Judaizers, i.e., Christians who demanded the observation of the Jewish law, including circumcision. But this interpretation raises serious questions. Today more and more it is admitted that the "pillars" in Jerusalem could not have been behind the agitation in Galatia. There was no such thing among the Jewish Christians as a radical group superior to James. Much evidence exists for the view that the heretics in Galatia were Jewish Christian Gnostics. The heretics attacked Paul with the argument that the Apostle should have received his apostolic power and his gospel directly from God, i.e., Christ. This, however, is a genuine Gnostic argument. The first two chapters of Gal and Gal 6:6 are more readily understood if Paul was fighting against Christian Gnostics who, as in Corinth, tried to destroy his influence by challenging his apostleship. The Galatian heretics demanded the circumcision of the Gentile Christians. Jewish Christian Gnosis according to the unanimous testimony of the Church fathers preached circumcision at the very time of Paul and in the Gentile countries, especially in Asia Minor. The characteristic of Gnostic circumcision was that it never obliged one to keep the Mosaic law; as a matter of fact, so little did the false teachers of Galatia demand the observance of the Law that Paul himself was the first to point out this conclusion to the community (Gal 5:3). In Gal 4:10 the expressions "days, months, times, and years," do not refer to the Jewish festival calendar, but the terms are found together often and are met frequently in the apocryphal and Gnostic literature. Gnostic speculations stand behind the Galatian observance of certain times (cf. a citation from the book of Elchasai preserved in Hippolytus, *Phil* IX, 162).

From Gal 6:1 the heretics evidently applied to themselves the name of *pneumatikoi* (cf. also 3:2; 5:25). Pride in the possession of the *pneuma* and vainglory are also characteristics of the Gnostics. From their possession of the *pneuma* the Gnostics derived their freedom from *sarx* and from all the moral ordinances concerning it. Gal 5:1, 13 clearly shows the Galatian heretics acted in the same manner. From 2 Cor 5:11 ff. the reproach of persuading men is

shown to be typically Gnostic, and the same Gnostic polemic can be inferred in Gal 1:10. For a complete picture of Galatian Gnosticism besides Gal one must have additional details found in 1 and 2 Cor which Schmithals treats in his book *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (Goettingen, 1956).—J. Bz.

107. J. E. SCHULTE, "De Apostel Paulus en zijn 'ziekte(n)'" [The Apostle Paul and his 'illness(es)'], *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 11 ('56-'57) 110-118.

Whatever has been said on the illnesses of St. Paul is medically unsound.—P. L. A.

108. E. SCHWEIZER, "Zur Frage der Echtheit des Kolosser- und des Epheserbriefe," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 287.

The address "(my) brothers" is found very often in all the letters of Paul, but is missing completely from Col, Eph, and the Pastorals, a situation which could argue against the Pauline authorship of these letters.—J. Bz.

109. C. SPICQ, "*Epipothein*, Désirer ou chérir?" *RevBib** 64 (2, '57) 184-195.

The verb *epipothein*, rare in classical literature, is a properly biblical term, occurring twelve times in the LXX and nine times in the NT Epistles. Correctly interpreted, it contributes to our understanding of *agape* in St. Paul. In the OT it includes in its meaning compassion, anxiousness, good or evil desire, longing, and love. In 1 Pt 2:2 it is an intense longing for "spiritual milk." In 1 Cor 5:2 it expresses a desire mingled with anxiety for heaven. St. Paul also uses the verb four times to indicate the desire to see someone after a separation, expressing the wish of Paul's great charity. In 2 Cor 9:14 he means by it a strong human love motivated by gratitude and informed with divine charity itself. Its highest expression of love is found in Phil 1:8, where the phrase corresponds to "loving in the heart of Christ." James uses the word (4:5) somewhat enigmatically, but it may best be taken as God's intensive and exclusive love of His creatures. Thus *epipothein* in the NT, and especially in St. Paul, means an intense desire in immediate relation to the love which arouses it. The best illustration of the delicate tenderness of Paul's charity is found in 1 Thes 2:7-8.—G. W. M.

110. A. STROBEL, "Zum Verständnis von Rm 13," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 67-93.

O. Cullmann's double significance of *exousiai* of Rom 13:1 ff., concerning the state and the angelic powers standing behind it, is untenable. (1) The hypothesis is first of all questionable because it supposes for its understanding of *exousiai* an unusual combination of traditionally different and even conflicting concepts of powers (angels of nations, guardian angels, angels of the elements). (2) Luke, for whom the Jewish-Hellenistic view of the world with its belief in angels and demons was an accepted fact, leaves no doubt about the purely profane meaning of *exousiai kai archai* (12:11; cf. 21:12). The supposition

that in the case of *archai kai exousiai* we are dealing with terms belonging to the language of secular administration is further strengthened by Lk 20:20. (3) Contemporary Latin has a corresponding combination of two concepts, viz. the union of *imperia et potestates*, and also *imperia et magistratus*. The everyday meaning of these words is clear. The language of civil bureaucracy is free from all conscious ambiguities. (4) It is clear again from Rom 13:1-7 that Paul was acquainted with legal terminology and official government procedure. (5) Conclusion: Rom 13:1-7 is filled with terms and images which prove that this section was written under the supposition that its audience had some knowledge of Roman administration and civil law. Its evident similarity to the usual language of civil government declares the section to be a secular text. Therefore it is highly improbable that *exousiai*, the main idea of the pericope, should also refer to a government by angels (*Engel-Obrigkeit*).—J. Bz.

111. S. ZEDDA, "Il carattere gnostico e giudaico dello errore colossese alla luce dei manoscritti del Mar Morto," *RivistBib** 5 ('57) 31-35.

The Gnostic character of the Colossians' error (Col 2:16-23) has always been recognized. An examination of the Dead Sea Scrolls would show it to be also Judaic in character. The essential nature of Gnosticism consists in knowledge and dualism. The latter includes these basic concepts: distinction between body and spirit in man, the existence of angels and of the demiurge who brought men into being, and the absolute transcendence of God. Whether dualism be absolute or relative, salvation through knowledge of the design of God is absolutely necessary.

In the Qumran writings dualism and knowledge play an important and prominent part. There is an over-all design of salvation (Man. 3:15; 3:16; 11:11; 4:6-8) which is the mystery of God (Hymns 3:23-24; Dam. Doc. 3:18). It was the duty of the instructor to make known this design or mystery of God to the members of the community (Hymns 5:1-3). Certain terms, v.g., *da'at* (Man 3:15; 4:4; 11:3; 11:15; 11:16; 4:22) may be traced back to the Sapiential Books. Dualism is the basis of the War Scroll wherein men are divided into two classes animated respectively by the bad and the good spirit. This dualism, however, is different from that of the Gnostics of the second century A.D.

Besides its Gnostic elements, the error of the Colossians contains other elements found in the Dead Sea Scrolls which link it with Judaism, v.g., beliefs in angels, visions, feasts, new moons, sabbaths, dietary restrictions. Thus the Colossians' error is Gnostic and Jewish at the same time. Gnosticism, therefore, would be an internal development within Judaeo-Christian circles. The Colossian-Qumran Gnosis may be considered as the forerunner of the later Gnosis of the second century.—C. S.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE

112. L. E. ELLIOTT-BINNS, "James i.18: Creation or Redemption?" *NTStud* 3 (2, '57) 148-161.

Does Jas 1:18 refer to man's first creation or to his second, his redemption? An examination of the language produces no conclusive result. Christians are called "first-fruits" by St. Paul, but the OT suggests the meaning "the choicest part which consecrates the rest," and the word can thus refer to man's first creation as well. *Ktisma* is almost decisive, since it usually refers to creation in general and is never applied to mankind by any other writer. The force of the context is also disputed, though it seems very probable that the whole context (13-18) is based on Gen, and that the previous verse refers to mankind in general.

The idea of rebirth is Hellenistic and alien to the thought of Jas. The idea of a new creation, however, is familiar to Judaism. Redemption is in fact the means by which creation attains the end which God intended that it should have. There are three stages in God's complete plan: (1) creation, (2) man's redemption, (3) the redemption of all things. James had not worked this out, but by overleaping the second stage, and connecting mankind closely with the rest of creation ("first-fruits"), he prepared the way for its insertion. Jas 1:18, therefore, cannot be taken as decisively demanding a reference to the original creation and to mankind as its first-fruits; but if understood this way, the meaning is satisfactory and in accord with the rest of the Epistle. Why then should we look further to the developments of later NT theology in the light of Hellenistic thought?—L. J.

113. M.-E. BOISMARD, "Une Liturgie baptismale dans la *Prima Petri* (suite)," *RevBib** 64 (2, '57) 161-183.

This second of two articles (cf. *NTA* 1, [1, '56] No. 97) compares 1 Pt and Jas for common elements derived from a baptismal liturgy. Jas is the later work, though its compiler sometimes used more primitive sources. (1) In 1 Pt 1:6-9, Jas 1:12, and Rom 5:2-5 we find a common logical sequence of ideas: joy through constancy in trials, with eschatological glory as reward for virtue proved by resistance, and all the result of our love of God. These ideas derive via a baptismal liturgy from common Jewish sources, as witnessed by Sir 2:1-16 and Wis 3:1-9. Jas is the more basic form though the similar passage in Jas 1:2-4 is probably dependent on 1 Pt. (2) 1 Pt 1:22-2:2 and Jas 1:17-21 both mention our divine birth by the word of God, in consequence of which we should cast off evil and embrace the Logos in order to be saved. Parallel liturgies were used here, the longer form in Jas due to a longer liturgy and the insertion of a separate logion in vv. 19-20 by the compiler. The passages differ most in that the word of God for 1 Pt is the Gospel message, but for Jas the Mosaic law, indicating that Jas is probably a Judaeo-Christian work. (3) 1 Pt 2:5 and Jas 1:26-27 have the common theme of Christian life conceived as a spiritual cult

in view of the preceding parallel statements. James's insistence on putting the word into practice was also part of the original liturgy (cf. 1 Jn 3:18 and Rom 2). (4) 1 Pt 5:5-9 and Jas 4:6-10 both cite Prov 3:34 (LXX), then advise self-humiliation and resistance to the devil. Both depend on a liturgical hymn probably used to conclude a series of counsels to various classes of people (as in Eph 5:22-6:18).

A concluding summary lists the parts of 1 Pt that reflect elements of a baptismal liturgy and identifies these elements as hymns, instructions, preparatory or concluding homilies, etc.—G. W. M.

114. M. DE JONGE, "Vreemdelingen en bijwoners. Enige opmerkingen naar aanleiding van 1 Pt. 2:11 en verwante teksten," [Aliens and exiles. Some remarks concerning 1 Pt. 2:11 and similar texts], *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 11 ('56-'57) 18-36.

(1) Eph 2:19. *Xenoi kai paroikoi* here refers to the situation in which the pagan Christians had been before their conversion. They were alien from the people or the household of God. Whether *sympolitai tôn hagiôn* implies the idea of the heavenly home-*polis* (cf. Phil 3:20) seems uncertain.

(2) 1 Pt 1:1,17; 2:11. *Parepidemois diasporas, paroikias, paroikous kai parepidemous*, though connected (just as in Eph 2:19) with the image of God's people and His household (2:4-10), are used differently here: precisely because they belong to God's people, the Christians are strangers in the world in which they are scattered (cf. Jas 1:1). No reference appears in these texts to a future gathering into the one heavenly home; all the emphasis lies on the parenetical theme that Christians, while living in this world, should yet be different from it (cf. Jn 17:16,18; Phil 2:15 etc.).

(3) Heb 11:8-16. Here our theme is used primarily with a view to the future homecoming. The main object of the admonitions, unlike those of 1 Pt., is that Christians should be steadfast in their faith (10:19-39; 11:1; 12:1). The heavenly *polis* is a future reality (11:10,14 ff.; 12:26-28; 13:14), though at the same time present (12:22 ff.); according to Gal 4:26; Phil 3:20; Apoc 3:12; 21:2 f., 10 ff., the heavenly Jerusalem exists even now in heaven, and Christians are already its citizens; but its appearance on earth lies in the future and is an object of hope.—P. L. A.

115. C. F. D. MOULE, "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 1-11.

A critical consideration of F. L. Cross's *I Peter, a Paschal Liturgy* occasions an alternative solution to the problems of this Epistle. Earlier, Streeter and Beare had advanced partition theories. Preisker found 1 Pt a baptismal liturgy. Cross holds that the letter is the celebrant's part of the baptismal Eucharist of the Paschal Vigil. The arguments are unconvincing and it is suggested instead that 1 Pt is perhaps a genuine letter addressed to the communities indicated, but actually sent in two forms: a terser form for those under

persecution (1:1-2:10 and 4:12-5:14) and a longer for those not (1:1-4:11 and 5:12-14). The present text contains the two forms within a common framework of salutations. The persecutions mentioned in the Epistle may have been local and not officially ordered by Rome, such as those referred to by Pliny. There are many NT references to such local persecutions. This explanation would remove one difficulty in the way of apostolic authorship.—L. J.

116. H. CROUZEL, "Le Dogme de la Rédemption dans l'Apocalypse," *BullLit-Eccl** 58 (2, '57) 65-92.

John has presented the redemption in the dramatic form of two cities, Jerusalem and Babylon, confronting each other. Each city has its protagonists, heavenly or diabolical; its citizens, the faithful or the wicked; and its own ideas of existence. Satan and his actors come on the scene launching a triple offensive of idolatry, persecution, and a parody of the redemption. But the Lamb conquers: Babylon is destroyed; the Beast is seized and cast down into the pool of fire; the Dragon is chained for a thousand years. Redemption is the sharing in this victory by the elect. Christ, who has now become the center and master of history, invites all men. According to their dispositions they participate in the victory or are condemned. They must be ready to bear witness to the word of God, to identify themselves with Jesus, to suffer martyrdom, to perform good works, and to pray. John has insisted at length on the risen Christ, Christ the avenger, because in this struggle, apparently hopeless, victory is assured. John has noted the exterior acts required of the future confessors of the faith and not the interior dispositions, because a general, when the battle is on, has no time to exhort his troops. Rather, he orders them into action. Thus the Apocalypse reflects the struggle of the Church amid the vicissitudes of the world.—E. F. K.

117. F. MUSSNER, "Neue Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes," *TrierTheolZeit** 66 (1, '57) 50-53.

The Munich exegete, J. Schmid, has recently completed his commentary on the Greek text of the Apocalypse. He examines the sixth-century MSS of the commentary of Andrew of Caesarea in Cappadocia, showing that the history of the text used in this commentary is not as clear as the commentary itself. The index at the end of the first and second parts of S's work is excellent. His most important achievement is the clarification of the textual history of the Greek Apoc. He inquires into the relation of Andrew's text to the "original text," concluding that the entire Greek rendition of the Apoc text falls into four textual families: AC, P⁴⁷S, Andrew-Text, Koine-Text. His investigations confirm the judgments of other scholars concerning the four oldest textual testimonies. In this work we finally possess an accurate edition of Andrew's text of Apoc. Now we might ask S to produce the critical edition of Apoc itself.—N. F. D.

118. T. F. TORRANCE, "Liturgie et Apocalypse," *VerbCaro* 11 ('57) 28-40.

The Apocalypse must be scrutinized in order better to understand the position of the Ascension and the second coming in the Church's liturgy. The point of view here considered is that of the modern liturgical renewal and its theological implications. Apoc is the most liturgical and most eschatological book of the NT. The NT liturgy must be characterized first by its difference from the OT cult, the latter being constantly dominated by the coming of the catastrophic new *eon*; the NT liturgy is characterized by the coincidence of the present and future *eon*. Apoc, then, is the unveiling of the mystery to come. Its principal means of expression are the projection of the life, death, and Resurrection of Christ across the centuries, and the use of the liturgical language, borrowed from the OT, but illuminated by the Holy Spirit. Apoc, then, is Christology projected into history. As the Gospels describe the veiling and unveiling of the Word made flesh, so does Apoc describe the history of His Church. Three points must be considered: (1) the OT liturgy was centered about the Exodus: eschatological salvation was seen in the light of this event as a new Exodus, headed by a new Redeemer, in a New Covenant. Those characteristics are visible in Apoc, describing a dynamic liturgy. (2) In the NT, these data are recentered about Christ. (3) The liturgy of heaven, in Apoc, is bound to the liturgy of the earth, and consequently illuminates the latter, presenting it as an echo, in terms of war and agony, of the heavenly liturgy. The liturgy of Apoc is also definitely cosmic and ecumenical; so then must be the direction of any liturgical renewal, especially related to the Eucharistic liturgy: any man-made restriction to participation in the Lord's banquet, any *ex-communication*, is against the clear teaching of Apoc. [This article was published in English in the *Church Service Society Annual* of the Church of Scotland.]—J. H.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

119. P. BENOIT, "The Holy Eucharist—II," *Scripture** 9 (1, '57) 1-14.

[Cf. *NTA* 1 (2, '57) no. 257.] Christ instituted the Eucharist in order to remain bodily present among men. The Eucharistic rite is neither merely a commemoration of His presence among us nor the expectation of a future presence. Such a dichotomy is exegetically unsound: the riches of both past and future are combined in the Christian present. Christ died and rose once; because of that Resurrection, His life and death overflow into a new, eternally present world (Rom 6:9-10; Heb 7:25; 9:24). As regards the future, the risen Christ has already taken His place in the eschatological era. By our union with Him through faith and the sacraments, we too share in this new era: one part of us is already dead to sin and risen with Christ, though we are still subject to sin and condemned to death. In the Eucharist we receive Christ as He now is, and thus share in the salvation He realized; we are also part of

the kingdom of God which has already begun (the "kingdom" Luke has in mind in 22:16, 18).

Because man is body as well as spirit it is not sufficient to believe in a spiritual presence of Christ by faith alone. To establish real contact one must reach the body as well as the soul—as God has always done in His dealings with men, as Christ did in His earthly ministry. When He wished to make His sacrifice permanent He took bread and wine in order to make this permanence tangible and perceptible. It is not that the bread and wine are mere symbols: they are actually the body and blood of Jesus Christ. To establish this it is not enough to stress the form of Christ's words—mere philology would allow of a symbolic interpretation. We must argue thus: that it is the purpose of a parable or of a symbol to make clear what is abstract or unseen by means of something concrete and visible. Now the body and blood of Christ were already concrete and visible at the Last Supper. Why then use symbols to convey the idea of body and blood? Still more, why command that these should be sacrificed, since they convey rather the idea of food? Our Lord, therefore, used bread and wine not to convey an idea, but to furnish His body and blood as food. "How can this thing be"? We believe it because of Christ's words and of His salvific intention, which are otherwise left unexplained. A philosophy of nature has helped towards an understanding of the mystery; but it remains a mystery.

Christ, as second Adam, carries in Himself all humanity, reuniting all that sin divided. Christians are His members because they share His risen life through union with Him; consequently, when we are united to His body in the Eucharist, we are united also to these members (1 Cor 10:16-17). The Eucharist contains the sacrifice of Christ since it is His body in the act of immolation. This sacrifice, moreover, is present here and now. But in a certain sense the Mass adds something to the sacrifice: the necessary concrete application to all, and the offering of the Church, which is the human participation desired by Christ. Christ did not use bread and wine as ephemeral modes of expression, but gave them a new being, and this being remains so long as those elements remain. Hence the Church's practice of reservation, satisfying our Lord's desire to remain always with us.—P. D.

120. P. BENOIT, "Les récits de l'institution et leur portée," *LumVie** 31 ('57) 49-76.

[Previously published in English. Cf. *NTA* 1 (2, '57) no. 257; and *supra* no. 119.]

121. P. BONNARD, "L'Esprit Saint et l'Église selon le Nouveau Testament," *RevHistPhilRel* 67 (1, '57) 81-90.

The relation Spirit-Church is based upon the relation Spirit-Christ. Once for all the Spirit has been given to the Church; now He vivifies from the interior; but the Church can resist this action. With reference to the origin

of the relation Spirit-Church, exegesis proposes three possible sources: Roman institutionalism, Protestant spiritualism, and an intermediate theory. Consequently we introduce into the life of the Church a fundamental distinction between the institution of the hierarchy and the action of the Spirit. In the NT, the main duality exists between the apostolic kerygma on one side and ministry and spiritual operation on the other. The apostolic kerygma, i.e., the usual tradition of the Church concerning Christ, controls the apostolate, taken as the basis of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; this position goes against spiritualism or ecclesiastical legalism.—J. P. C.

122. R. CAEMMERER, "The Educational Use of Scripture in the Light of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," *ConcTheolMon* 28 (4, '57) 211-219.

Basically the Scriptures have this core-function of the Spirit's teaching: to bring to recollection the saving work of Jesus. 2 Tim 3:14-15 describes the process by which the Scriptures place and keep a man in the justified relation with God. The Holy Spirit in and through the Scriptures brings the work of Christ again into the lives of people.—J. O'R.

123. J. DANIELOU, "Trinité et Angélologie dans la Théologie judéo-chrétienne," *RechScienRel** 45 (1, '57) 5-41.

One of the characteristics of the archaic, Judaeo-Christian theology of the Trinity is the employment of categories borrowed from Angelology to furnish designations for the Word and the Spirit. So common was the usage that the word *angel* became a technical expression for designating a Divine Person.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* not only makes use of a simple analogy in which the word *angel* is employed to designate the Word, but even changes the structure of the late-Jewish theme of the seven archangels so that they become six archangels surrounding the Word of God. Yet a third type of accommodation in Hermas is the use of the name *Michael* to designate not the archangel but Christ, an assimilation which is found in various Judaeo-Christian apocrypha as well as in Ebionite literature. The assimilation of Michael to the Word has for its counterpart and confirmation that of Gabriel to the Holy Spirit, although the name *Gabriel* is also used to designate the Word. Again, both Justin and Philo, although they differ in explaining the nature of the *Logos*, agree in assigning *Israel* as one of the names of the *Logos*, a designation which is also employed in a curious passage in the apocryphal *Prayer of Joseph*.

As designations for the Word and the Spirit Origen employs the two seraphim of the sixth chapter of Isaiah, the cherubim of the Tabernacle, and the seraphim of the Propitiatory. Both Origen and Philo would seem to have drawn their related treatment of the seraphim from a Judaeo-Christian work. On the other hand, in his development of the cherubim theme Origen clearly depends on Philo to whose allegorical interpretation he gives a Trinitarian transposition. In *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching* Irenaeus has a

Trinitarian accommodation similar to Origen's for which he would seem to have depended on the *Ascension of Isaiah* rather than on Philo. Thus, a Judaeo-Christian source would seem to be the origin of the Trinitarian accommodation found not only in Origen and Irenaeus, but also of the very generic enunciation of this same theme found in the Elkasite form of the Judaeo-Christian Gnosticism.

Quite different from anything that has preceded is the treatment of the theology of the Holy Spirit in terms of the Essenian doctrine of the two Spirits. Hermas' use of this theme in treating of the Holy Spirit helps to explain the confusing character of his Trinitarian theology. The Ebionites also employed the Essenian concept of the "Prince of Lights," but they referred it to Christ whom they reduced to the status of a mere creature, albeit the principal archangel. Finally, a clear reference to Pentecost is had when the Jewish tradition of the Temple angel is applied to the Holy Spirit who abandoned the Temple at Jerusalem in order to sweep like a flame over the nations of the earth.—E. R. C.

124. E. DES PLACES, "Hymnes grecs au seuil de l'ère chrétienne," *Biblica** 38 (2, '57) 113-129.

The writer examines the literary form and the doctrinal content of some Greek religious hymns of the fourth century B.C. and the second century A.D. The hymns examined are two paeans of the end of the classical age, one to Hygeia, the goddess of health, by Aripbron, c. 400, the other to Virtue by Aristotle, fourth century; and two other hymns to more personal deities: one to Zeus by Cleanthes, fourth-third century, the other to Isis by Mesomedes, A.D. 135. The essential constituents of these hymns are: invocation to the deity, motives of the prayer, and formulation of the petition. They all show monotheistic or at least henotheistic tendencies and prepared the way for the propagation of the Christian religion throughout the Greek world.—P. P. S.

125. R. DE VAUX,* "A propos de la Théologie Biblique," *ZeitAltWiss* 68 (4, '56) 225-227.

Because the OT is for millions of believers a sacred book, the scientific study of OT religion must result in a religious study of the OT. The goal of all scientific biblical research is biblical theology, the science of God and man elaborated in the light of faith. The Christian must study the OT in view of the NT, the two forming one theology of the Bible. The scholar may limit himself to the history of biblical thought, knowing that his study does not exhaust the meaning of the Bible.—G. W. M.

126. H. DONAGHY, "God with Us," *Worship** 31 (5, '57) 276-284.

The presence of God in the midst of His chosen people was known as the "Shekinah," derived from the Hebrew word *shakan*, "to dwell." St. John uses the Greek word *eskenosen*, "pitched his tent." This abiding and protecting

presence was localized for the ancient Jews in the ark and is now found more fully by Christians in the NT and in the mystical body.—G. F. G.

127. C. H. DODD, "Jésus, Signe de contradiction," *BibVieChrét** 17 ('57) 7-16.

[A partial translation of the author's book, *The Bible Today*.] The prophets view history as God's confronting man with judgment and mercy to which man must respond. The Evangelists follow the same pattern. After a period of open rebellion by patriots and zealots, the scribes and Pharisees preached a policy of submission and a scrupulous observance of the Mosaic law. Popular piety and patriotism, however, were nourished with apocalypses of a quasi-political Messiah. The rebellious attitude finally culminated in the fall of the Jewish state.

When Christ entered on the Palestinian scene, He made friends and enemies with all factions. More than the hostility of His enemies, His proposal of the absolute, the kingdom of God, isolated Him. Although this kingdom was crassly interpreted, nevertheless it was understood that God would at last reveal His power and glory and transform man. Actually Christ's kingdom was established by His impact on the historical situation, i.e., by His actions operating decisively on persons and events falling within His orbit. The OT prophetic preaching concerning the judgment of God and His mercy is found in Christ's suffering and love. For the first Christians, the Resurrection of Christ meant that He would give a second chance to those who abandoned Him at the Crucifixion—another significant realization of the prophets' judgment and mercy. This very death and Resurrection of Christ, and not the disciples' power of organization, really established the Church. By emphasizing the historical event of the Crucifixion through the Eucharistic words of the Last Supper, the Church reiterates the prophets' viewpoint.—J. A. G.

128. A. M. DUBARLE, "Le péché originel dans les livres sapientiaux," *Rev-Thom** 56 (4, '56) 597-619.

The OT presents in various places references to the story of the Fall in Eden. The consequences of the sin of Adam were not understood, however, as the doctrine of original sin in the strict sense was not understood by the authors of the OT. It was for St. Paul to clearly state that death came into the world through the sin of Adam (Rom 5:12-19). OT authors of the sapiential books referring to the Fall are not as positive on the point. Physical death and dissolution were considered by them as the natural destiny of a body made from dust. Spiritual death of the soul was attributed to the envy of Satan who would tempt men to idolatry. The hereditary effects of Adam's sin in weakening and contaminating the human race were not mentioned. Such transmission of evil was limited to idolaters and adulterers. In Sir and Wis the two sages who each have outlined a sort of sacred history have not revealed the effects of the first sin in the moral and religious domain. When the wisdom tradition explained evil as the punishment of a sin, the sages were not pressed to find other

causes than those actually observable, faults of an individual or of his immediate ancestors. Likewise, they sought the manifestation of providential reward at first in the events of the present life, and only much later did they point out the existence of future sanctions. These sages are the forerunners of the theological movement which emphasizes the good in human nature in spite of the wounds of sin.—J. P. W.

129. W. EICHRDT, "The Law and the Gospel," *Interpretation* 11 (1, '57) 23-40.

What does the Law have to do with the Gospel? In particular, are we to reject the Ten Commandments on the same grounds that the rest of the OT is superseded? First, the Ten Commandments must be considered in relation to OT law. Couched in the form of apodictic law ("Thou shalt"), they point to a different origin than the casuistic form of law ("If you do this"), namely, the will of the deity made known to the people. Such laws have a wider content; religion and morality also were ruled by them. Thus there are two legal traditions in the OT; the forceful presentation of the Decalogue accords with the tradition of its Mosaic origin. The Ten Commandments, analyzed individually, exercise a strong influence on the other legal tradition of the OT. They constitute an ethics similar to that which governed other ancient communities, but go beyond the juridical aspects of moral life in commanding love of God. This is the light in which the meaning of the Decalogue can be seen. The commandments are not an infallible, perfect, and final verbal revelation of the will of God, but practical instructions for the realization of the commandment of love that were to aid ancient Israel in its concrete situation. The Ten Commandments thus find new applications in the Gospels. But not only does the Decalogue direct our behavior by love; it also has a judging and condemning effect on us. In Christ the Law is fulfilled; in Christ we are transferred from the condemnation of the Law to the new creation of God in Christ and thus the true purpose of the Law is fulfilled in us. Lastly, with Christ as the center of the treatment of the Law, we can pick our path between the reef of Judaistic legalism and the shoal of an antinomian message of faith.—R. J. B.

130. J. T. FORESTELL, "Christian Revelation and the Resurrection of the Wicked," *CathBibQuart** 19 (2, '57) 165-189.

The doctrine of the Resurrection in the OT grew from a fusion of the Hellenistic idea of immortality and the concept of individual retribution. The literature of the period also couples the historic judgment of the nations with the spiritual resurrection of Israel. These elementary notions persisted into NT times. The Messiah was expected to restore the Jewish nation and to judge its oppressors. Subsequently, in a general judgment of all mankind, the just would receive the reward of eternal life and the wicked would be condemned to eternal punishment. But by this time, the spiritual and moral resurrection of

God's people which characterized the teaching of Ezekiel and the OT prophets had completely disappeared. The rabbinic literature of the time shows these same constants, but in 2 Baruch and 4 Esdras, there is the first evidence of a bodily resurrection for all men, about which however there is no fixed doctrine. The reunion of the soul and body is not the center of the resurrection-doctrine.

Among the Jews of NT times, the Pharisees taught retribution for all. The NT itself introduces a notion of judgment presently active among men, and also the person of the judge, Christ, present now, as in the last days, judging all men. While little light is shed on the final lot of the wicked, the reward for the just appears in a new context entirely, epitomized in the Resurrection of Christ Himself, in which the nature of our bodily resurrection is revealed. Through the risen Christ, the expectations of the OT prophets and of contemporary Judaism are fulfilled. From there, the resurrection becomes more closely identified with life, symbolized in the sacrament of baptism. Christian resurrection begins with baptism and endures through union with the life of Christ to the bodily resurrection of the last day.—C. A. W.

131. M. FRANZMANN, "The Apostolate: Its Enduring Significance in the Apostolic Word," *ConcTheolMon* 28 (3, '57) 174-191.

The apostolate is a creation, a vessel, a gift of God's grace to the Church, for the apostle has what he has received in order to transmit it. In the apostolic word we have the quintessence of the apostolate active in the Church. Of all that the apostles received and were, the word is all that we have. This, written or reechoed in the living voice of "apostolic men," is the enduring embodiment of Jesus; by it the Church is perpetually called into being.—J. O'R.

132. G. GHYSENS, "Dieu nous parle de la Joie," *BibVieChrét** 17 ('57) 30-44.

G sketches the NT theology of joy with relevant texts briefly explained to prove his thesis that joy ought to be the specific attitude of a Christian because God revealed it. The infancy narratives are punctuated with explosions of joy; the public life of Christ and the Resurrection-Ascension episodes depict the passage from a hesitant to an exuberant joy. All these narratives demonstrate the joy of the "sensible" presence. Joy in personal disclosures is described as a "joy of being together," as is depicted in the breaking of bread (cf. also Phil 2:25-30). Other texts which are more doctrinal invite us to rejoice, and explain why; e.g., 1 Thes 2:19-20, etc. Such texts radiate apostolic joy.

In the second part of his article G delineates the mysterious joy of faith in spite of God's absence (Jn 20:29). The hagiographers often note that the word of God is received with joy by believers. Moreover, they point out the connection between joy and the Holy Spirit, e.g., in the episodes of the Ethiopian and of the jailer at Philippi. In a lengthy parenthesis the author explains why faith, in spite of its obscurity, is a cause of joy. G then elaborates on the paradoxical coexistence of the mysterious joy of faith with suffering. Some examples are: the Beatitudes, the joy in the lives of the saints and martyrs, and that in Paul's

own life. Paul is proud of his joy and wants to share it, and in Col 1:24 we find the fundamental reason of this paradox.

In the third section G shows that the profound reason for Christian joy is in the "communion" of the faithful among themselves and with the Trinity. This joy originates in the Father, expands in us via Jesus Christ, and communicates itself to us in the Holy Spirit. This joy is God's own joy and is to be shared as God desires, through the obscurity of faith, suffering, and death.—J. A. G.

133. J. GIBLET, "Le Temple de l'Éternelle Alliance," *EglViv** 9 (2, '57) 122-125.

The Temple in Jerusalem had symbolized the old alliance. It was here that the Jews communicated with God. When Jesus prophesied that He would rebuild the Temple—which was His body—He foretold the end of the old economy. On Easter Christ fulfilled this prophecy. He became the new and eternal Temple, the true tabernacle of God among men. The rebuilding of the Temple is the mission of Christ after the Resurrection. By it He sanctifies and leads men to His Father. In so doing He unites them to Himself. Thereby men also become temples of God in the New Covenant.—P. C. W.

134. W. GRUNDMANN, "Sohn Gottes," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 113-133.

Judaism possessed no unified concept of the Messiah; rather, until the time of Jesus, two or three Messianic figures were expected: the Messianic High Priest, the Messianic King, and the Prophet. The Messianic High Priest, especially awaited among the members of the Essene sect, seems to have been considered a son of God; the Servant of Yahweh, they understood, represented this High Priest. The Pharisees were able to interpret the different Messianic figures as different functions of the one Kingly Messiah. The sonship of Jesus, which the Synoptics attest, and which the Fourth Evangelist strikes as the keynote of his witness to Christ, is a relative concept inseparably bound up with the unique way in which Jesus preached about "the Father"; His pronouncements were fundamentally opposed to the beliefs of the Jews. The texts of Qumran, so far as they are yet known, do not refer to God as "Father." Thus it becomes evident that the sonship of Jesus, though prefigured in the expectation of the Messianic High Priest, attains its full and proper interpretation only in relation to His knowledge of God. Hence the sonship is not primarily a title such as might have been originated by Hellenistic thought; rather is it His own revelation, disclosing the mystery of His nature.—J. Bz.

135. J. HARVEY, "Symbolique et théologie biblique," *SciencEccl** 9 (2, '57) 147-157.

Biblical theology must not neglect the fact that symbolic expressions are widely used in the Bible and must have a meaning. They are not to be considered as mere literary artifices, which could be calculated consciously by the authors to favor a better understanding of truths otherwise too abstract for

their simple audience. They are the natural form of expression intended by God, aiming at reaching the whole soul and causing a *realization* of the meaning more than a mere *understanding*. They must be handled according to their proper laws. An explanation is offered for the multiple meaning of the same symbol, and a pattern of the world of symbol is proposed and explained.—J. H. (Author).

136. S. V. McCASLAND, "Signs and Wonders," *JournBibLit* 76 (2, '57) ✓ 149-152.

The idiomatic phrase *semeia kai terata* (signs and wonders) is found many times in Greek literature, in Greek translations of the OT, and sixteen times in the NT. In the two former groups it most frequently intends grandiose phenomena such as those typical of Exodus. In the NT, however, it refers almost entirely to ordinary deeds of healing performed by faith, whose purpose is confirmation of the claims of the prophets, disciples, and apostles as messengers of God. Jesus appears to have been opposed to the basic idea of signs and wonders, never in this way exploiting His ability to heal. His attitude is shown in the story of the temptation, wherein He refuses to exploit His power. The early Church would have its signs and wonders nonetheless. The simplicity of Mk 8:11-12 is developed in Mt 16:4 and Lk 11:29, and still further developed in Mt 12:39-41. The many signs referred to in John reflect a final stage of development.—W. F. K.

137. R. D. RICHARDSON, "The Lord's Prayer as an Early Eucharistia," *Angl-TheolRev* 39 (2, '57) 123-130.

How great an influence on developing liturgical forms did the Lord's Prayer exert in the early centuries? Evidence in *Didache* 9-10 indicates that the prayer "once could provide a pattern for the eucharistia itself." *Didache* 9 consists "entirely in the Lord's Prayer recast, interpreted, and transformed into a thanksgiving." The liturgical implications may be seen in a clause-by-clause explanation of *Didache* 9.—V. J. B.

138. K. RUDOLPH, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," *ZeitRelGeist* 9 (1, '57) 1-20.

The comment on Gen 1:26 in the Apocryphal John of Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (published by W. Till in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altch. Lit.* 60 = 5/5; Berlin 1955) confirms that the derivation of Gnosis from Christianity has no longer any serious foundation. A parallel is claimed in Irenaeus *Haer.* 1,30,6.—R. N.

139. P. SCHÜTZ, "Existenz—Praeexistenz—Postexistenz," *ZeitRelGeist* 9 (2 [Sonderheft: Reinkarnation], '57) 103-115.

Reincarnation is the most attractive concept offered by the Buddhist missions (130 in North America! 5 in Germany). Augustine *Civ.* 12 argued from the

time-bound incarnation of the preexistent Christ to the impossibility of reincarnation. The Bible says astonishingly little about the *Pre-* of man's existence except for "the myth of original sin." In John, only the "Son of Man" has Pre-Existence and Post-Existence. Nevertheless the Gospel hints at Moses, Elijah, or someone else coming back from the dead. The future life is only a mystery; 1 Cor 13-15: creation "in God's image" is a comment on man's "pre-existence" which hints at his "post-existence."—R. N.

140. P. SEETHALER, "Das Licht in Schrift und Liturgie," *BenMon** 33 (1-2, '57) 33-43.

S discusses the language of light-symbolism as a means of divine revelation of the unity of God in the OT and of the Trinity in the NT; the use of this symbolism in the sacred texts of the liturgical year; and light as a symbol of divine grace and supernatural life, in both Scripture and liturgy.—F. X. W.

141. E. F. SIEGMAN, "The Blood of the Covenant," *AmEcclRev** 136 (3, '57) 167-174.

Did the apostles understand Jesus as He instituted the Eucharist? They were well equipped to understand Him from their OT background. One phrase they readily recognized is "My blood of the covenant." The word *new* may be an insertion from 1 Cor 11:25, due to Paul or the tradition he records; but that leaves the central question untouched, since the New Covenant does not replace the Old but flows out of it. "Blood of the covenant" necessarily reminded the apostles of the Sinai covenant (Exod 19:5 ff.), ratified by the shedding of blood to portray that Yahweh and His people are "blood-relatives." Granted the development that took place in Hebrew psychology, as well as the differences between their psychology and ours, it remains true that the blood of the covenant at the Last Supper must have suggested to the apostles the sacrificial character of the rite that Jesus was performing. Exodus records two traditions of the ceremony that sealed the Sinai covenant, but both include the sacrifice that made Yahweh and His people blood-relatives, and its climax: the communion banquet in the presence of Yahweh—the historic seal of friendship. For to eat with enemies was unthinkable. Further, the apostles must have realized that the covenant is now fulfilled: what Yahweh had done on Mt. Sinai was a beginning, a first aspect of the perfect covenant-act realized in Christ's action. Thirdly, the covenant fulfilled must mean community of life; the sharing of the blood of the covenant illustrates the community of life between Jesus and His disciples, representatives of the new Israel. The institution of the Eucharist at the Passover meal emphasizes that the banquet is a covenant ceremony. Though he omits the institution of the Eucharist, John shows that he is thinking along the same lines by his references to the Christians' intimacy with the Blessed Trinity, the dialogue with Philip, and the allegory of the vine. By this rite, therefore, Christ fulfills and perfects the Old Covenant, uniting men to Himself as "blood brothers," and thus to the Father.—I. J. M.

142. D. M. STANLEY, "The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism: an Essay in Biblical Theology," *TheolStud** 18 (2, '57) 169-215.

In her explanation of the Christian mystery, the apostolic Church was guided by two factors: the experience of the first disciples and the sacred history of Israel as interpreted by Christian faith. Consequently, the frame of reference of NT sacramental theology is a triple one, corresponding to a threefold division of the history of salvation: (1) the period before Christ, (2) Christ's earthly life, (3) His glorified life extending to His body, the Church. The inspired NT writers take the view that sacramental symbolism derives its efficacious signification from the divine plan of the redemption as it was worked out on this threefold level. Their main interest centered, not on the *ex opere operato* (the Semite knew that any God-given sign was by that fact efficacious), but on the meaning of the sacramental sign. The method of investigation here employed follows this typically biblical viewpoint and aims at a synthesis of baptismal doctrine found in the NT as it is related to the triple level of sacred history.

The *gesta Dei*, narrated in the OT, which influence baptismal symbolism are (1) the creation, (2) the deluge and Noah's ark, (3) the promise to Abraham with its seal, circumcision, (4) the Exodus from Egypt, Israel's wandering in the desert, the Mosaic covenant, and (5)—less clearly perhaps—the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua.

Jesus' earthly career, as preached in the apostolic kerygma and later enshrined in the apostolic teaching of the written Gospels, contributed to baptismal symbolism under the following headings: (1) John the Baptist and the "restoration of all things," (2) Jesus' baptism by John in the Jordan, (3) Jesus' symbolic actions during the public ministry (obscure in the Synoptics, but carefully exploited by the Fourth Gospel).

The mysteries of Christ's exaltation which have significance for our subject are (1) His death and Resurrection (considered as the two phases of the Father's redemptive act), (2) His Ascension into heaven (which, theologically, means His *sessio ad dexteram Patris*), (3) the Pentecostal experience and practice of Christian baptism, (4) the evolution in the understanding of the antithesis "John with water—Christ with the Spirit," (5) the administration of baptism "in Jesus' Name."—D. M. S. (Author).

143. Y. TRÉMEL, "Remarques sur l'expression de la foi trinitaire dans l'église apostolique," *LumVie** 29 ('56) 617-642.

This article points out traces of early Trinitarian faith as found in the apostolic writings, showing how it is conspicuous in the liturgical formulae, in the professions of faith, and in all that we call kerygma. The first part of the article embodies an explanation of these three fonts with regard to Christocentric and Trinitarian faith. The second part expounds the question: which of these schemes, namely the Christological or the Trinitarian, has better conserved the essence of the Christian faith? Only the Trinitarian faith could allow a glimpse into the unsearchable mystery of God transcending the salvific

designs accomplished by Jesus Christ, for this faith was more permeable to the plenitude of the mystery of Christ, Son of God, preexisting and sent by the Father, who entered into divine glory by the Resurrection, and was fully revealed in His divine condition by the sanctifying power of the Spirit.—J. G. C.

144. R. McL. WILSON, "The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 236-243.

The publication of Berlin Coptic Codex 8502 has made available three Gnostic documents, the shortest of which, the *Gospel according to Mary*, is here studied. The date of the codex is not later than the fifth century, but the gospel is based on a Greek original and is probably considerably older than the third century. It is made up of two distinct parts: a dialogue (on the style of a Hermetic dialogue) between Peter and the Savior, and a long speech by Mary recounting the revelation made to her by the Savior. Tentatively, it may be suggested that it is the work of a Christian Gnostic editor who has incorporated a dialogue of a "Hermetic" type and an account of the ascent of the soul, into a framework consisting of NT citation and his own free composition. The fact that the work uses direct translation from the Greek, while the NT references are echoes rather than direct quotations, makes it very difficult to draw conclusions regarding the text of the NT. But there is close familiarity with several books of the NT, especially the Gospels.—L. J.

145. F. WULF, "Er selbst ist unser Friede," *GeistLeb** 30 (2, '57) 85-89.

The "Peace to you" with which Christ often greeted the apostles, especially after the Resurrection, is far more than a simple greeting. It implies adoption as sons of God, remission of sin, and a renewal of friendship with God, and is therefore the first-fruits of faith in the risen Christ and the source of all Christian joy. This peace has degrees: first, it implies forgiveness of sin, which makes the sacrament of penance the Easter gift par excellence; secondly, it reflects the tranquility of a soul in union with God: to live in God's peace is to live in His love. Christ is not only the author of this peace by His Passion and death, but is the active mediator of peace in the soul: He makes us God's sons, infuses grace in our souls, and is the cause of our peace by reason of His eternal intercession for us with the Father. Finally, Christ is our peace in that He unites in Himself, hypostatically, the divine and human natures, thus exemplifying perfectly the union between God and man which is the fruit of the cross.—I. J. M.

-
146. J. A. O'FLYNN, "New Testament and Mythology," *IrTheolQuart** 24 (1, '57) 1-12; 109-121.

In his demythologizing of the Christ-event, Bultmann concentrates on the cross and Resurrection, and he distinguishes between the cross considered in its

historisch aspect; i.e., as an event of history which took place under Pontius Pilate and can be established by historical investigation, and the cross as a *geschichtlich* salvation-event. The term *geschichtlich* is employed by Bultmann to designate the permanent, universal significance of the cross to the designs of God. The cross has this *geschichtlich* significance because in it is accomplished in some way the judgment of God on the world; this judgment is a condemnatory judgment on the world of tangible realities, and a warning against the folly of trying to build our security on it or to reach authentic existence by relying on our own efforts. At the same time, this judgment is a liberating judgment, because in addition to showing the extent of man's "fallenness," it also makes known to us that what man cannot do for himself God does for him, when in the encounter with the Christian message the believer takes the decision to throw himself on the love of God. It is only through the proclamation of the Christian message and in the encounter of faith that the *geschichtlich*, salutary significance of the cross is appreciated; it does not reveal itself through miraculous signs which would come under the scrutiny of the historian. The saving significance of the cross is made contemporary in every generation by the proclamation of the Christian message, which challenges the listener to accept the vital significance of the cross and, at the same time, gives to him the opportunity of reaching proper understanding of himself.

The purpose of the narrative of the Resurrection in the NT kerygma is to express the triumphant significance of the cross. *Faith in the resurrection is nothing other than faith in the cross as salvation-event, faith in the cross as the cross of Christ.* The NT account of the Resurrection is not to be understood as the record of an objective fact, distinct from the cross, a miracle which would guarantee the salutary efficacy of the cross. Faith in the Resurrection means the intelligent acceptance of the word of preaching which proclaims the salutary significance of the cross. The decision of faith to appropriate to oneself the salutary significance of the cross is not a blind, arbitrary decision, even though it does not claim the support of miracles, etc. The message of the cross, when it is properly apprehended, is found to correspond to and illuminate man's natural understanding of his own existence, and it also answers to a profound aspiration of man's being.

In his interpretation of the cross and Resurrection, Bultmann obviously is trying to put the Christ-event, considered as the vital salvation-event, beyond the reach of the type of criticism which he regards as fatal to the traditional, "mythical" statements of the redemptive efficacy of the cross. He also introduces the alternative, "non-mythical" modes of expression, e.g., decision, encounter, confront, which he considers necessary in order that the Christian message of salvation may make some impact on the minds of men whose outlook is conditioned by science and contemporary philosophical analysis of man's own being. By stripping the salvation-event of its mythological dress, Bultmann contends that he is doing full justice to the *paradox of the NT proclamation.*

Bultmann's interpretation of the Christ-event and its salutary significance

involves the denial of the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. It gives us a soteriology without a Christology; we cannot regard Christ as the preexistent Son of God. The notion of an "objective" divine action in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ is essential to Bultmann's theory, if he is to have an answer to the criticism that he has merely given an old-style liberal view or a modern philosophical theory in the guise of Christian revelation. It is in fact open to grave doubt whether Bultmann is able consistently to maintain the "objective" character of the divine intervention in Christ. Bultmann's interpretation of the Christ-event has caused grave concern among non-Catholics, particularly in Germany, and Catholic writers commonly stress the essential link between Bultmann's thought and the theology of the Reformers, asserting that the crisis provoked by Bultmann's views is insoluble on the principles of Protestant theology.—J. A. O'F. (Author).

147. D. M. STANLEY, "Rudolf Bultmann: A Contemporary Challenge to the Catholic Theologian," *CathBibQuart** 19 (3, '57) 347-355.

The author's aim is to underscore the values, for present-day Catholic NT studies, found in the thought of Rudolf Bultmann as exposed in the method called *Entmythologisierung*.

Bultmann proposes a way out from the complete skepticism which the *Formgeschichtliche Methode* appears to him to produce in Christian minds. The Bultmannian conception of "myth" poses a genuine problem in NT interpretation: e.g., to grasp the Christian insight into the meaning of Christ's Ascension we must, with Pierre Benoit, distinguish between the "theological" and the "visible" Ascension. Bultmann's triple category of NT affirmations (*historisch, mythologisch, geschichtlich*) is significant for the modern exegete, and something may be said for his preoccupation with anthropology (he "re-mythologizes" to awaken faith in modern man). However, the demythologized version of the cross and the Resurrection are not merely unbiblical: they are unchristian.

On the positive side, Bultmann has made the following significant contributions: (1) his insistence upon the theme of revelation and the insertion of God's word into history, (2) his laudable effort to represent God's message to twentieth-century man, which arises from a clear insight into the problem of *fides quaerens intellectum*, (3) his successful attempt to draw attention to the existentialist nature of biblical thought, and (4)—most of all—his demonstration of the inadequacy of human language to express the *res Christiana* in its full reality (and his intellectual honesty in frankly admitting his attempt to "re-mythologize" the Christian message).—D. M. S. (Author).

148. R. TUCCI, "Un nuovo allarme tra i teologi protestanti," *CivCatt** 108 (Mar. 16, '57) 580-593.

The outburst of interest in Bultmann's theory among Protestant theologians shows that he has called attention to a weak spot in the Protestant position.

He is considered by some to be a "symbol of a dangerous theological radicalism." In its negative aspect, its attempt to "liberate the Gospel message from its mythological accretions," demythologizing betrays a prejudiced attitude of skepticism towards the historical value of the Gospels and the actual, historical existence of Jesus. Though he claims to accept an "historical" Christ, B begins his investigation by eliminating all possibility that the "Christ of history" and the "Christ of faith" can be identical. The invalidity of his postulates can be shown only on the plane of historical criticism. It is basically B's exegesis which is at fault. B's method has merit in that it recalls attention to the existence of an oral tradition before the composition of the written Gospel, and to the existence of a Church, a religious authority, before the written Gospel. His method of studying the oral tradition and the pre-Gospel history of the Church is useful provided it is not carried to an extreme; i.e., to an excessive concern with minute points. As a solution to the historical problems of the Gospel, B's theory is unacceptable to Catholics and religious-minded Protestants alike, because it makes it impossible to reach the "historical Christ." —A. A. C.

149. W. G. KUMMEL, "L'eschatologie conséquente d'Albert Schweitzer jugée par ses contemporains," *RevHistPhilRel* 37 (1, '57) 58-70.

Albert Schweitzer, following J. Weiss and R. Kabisch, sees in consequent eschatology the key to the doctrine of Jesus and Paul. Their thought stemmed from the apocalyptic movement of lower-Judaism, as may be seen in Mt 10 and 11. Given this hypothesis, Christ's moral teachings are transitory, a preparation for the coming parousia. Schweitzer encountered opposition, oftentimes violent, from liberal and conservative Protestants, but with the publication of *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (1930), he succeeded in bringing the majority of Protestant theologians to accept his position.—P. E. L.

150. D. J. SELBY, "Changing Ideas in New Testament Eschatology," *Har-TheolRev* 50 (1, '57) 21-36.

C. H. Dodd's theory of realized eschatology fails to distinguish adequately the anticipating events and the *eschaton* itself, the eschatological Man and the eschatological Event. By a chronological arrangement of the material, based on the fact that there are in the NT various eschatological ideas which "correct" one another but often coexist, the present paper seeks a hypothesis that fits the often divergent facts. Four periods of NT eschatological development may be distinguished. In Period A, that of the public ministry of Jesus, the preaching of John the Baptist and of Jesus shows that the final events have begun and the *eschaton* is expected to follow immediately. The nature of the *eschaton* is not clearly defined, but the apostles evidently expected a political event. Many NT passages as we have them show the result of a later "correcting" of the ideas of this period (Lk 19:11 ff.; 24:13 ff.; Mk 8:31 ff.; etc.). As

OT material is applied to Christ, it helps mold the Messianic tradition about Him: Davidic ancestry is either affirmed (as in the genealogies) or denied of Him (Mk 12:35 and par.); the coming of Elijah is explained by the Precursor John or by the appearance of Elijah at the Transfiguration. The eschatological Man is present, but the Event has not come; its failure to arrive is attributed to the intransigence of the Jews. In Period B the basic ideas of A persist, while the "corrected" form of Christ's words shows that all had been foretold, only the disciples did not realize it. The distinctive note here is that with the death and exaltation of Jesus, the necessary condition for the *eschaton* has been fulfilled; the parousia is still imminent. Periods C and D have no clearly definable limits. In the former the parousia is felt to be delayed in favor of the world mission of the Church, but it will then follow immediately. Interest grows in the day to day ethical problems of the Church and in the details of apocalypticism. In the final period the *eschaton* recedes into the indefinite future as individual eschatology (personal immortality) and the role of the Church in the world come to the fore (cf. the Johannine writings and Hebrews). —G. W. M.

151. H. SCHUSTER, "Die konsequente Eschatologie in der Interpretation des Neuen Testamentes, kritisch betrachtet," *ZeitNTWiss* 47 ('56) 1-25.

Thoroughgoing eschatology, as represented by A. Schweitzer, M. Werner, F. Buri, and U. Neuenschwander, presupposes that Jesus considered as a fixed program the apocalyptic concepts both of the son of man and of the world crisis (*Weltenwende*), along with all that they imply, as they are portrayed in Daniel and the book of Henoch. This view, however, overlooks the fact that it does not befit a man of genius, who was greater than any prophet, to make himself dependent on any sort of prearranged dogmatic program. Besides it is questionable whether this program was entrusted to the disciples and the people to the extent that they thought and hoped according to its outlines. At that time among the Jews there were many different eschatological viewpoints (*Zukunftserwartungen*). The majority of the people would have had little sympathy with the Messianic hopes expressed in the apocalypticism of Daniel and Henoch, and they would much rather have cherished nationalist and political hopes of an earthly kingdom of David (Ps Sal 17:21-28; Mt 21:9; Mk 13:21-22; Acts 5:38-39). The term *basileia* does not always mean a future entity, as the thoroughgoing eschatologists maintain, but more often refers to one already present (Mt 12:28-29; Lk 11:20; Mt 13:17; Lk 10:23-24; Lk 10:18; Mk 2:19). It is doing violence to the facts if one makes the expectation of an imminent apocalyptic eschatology the principle for exegesis and the norm to determine the historicity of each narrative and in this way to eliminate statements which refer to the present. In the revelation of Jesus, the eschatological scheme in which He emerges as the successor of the Baptist is time and again shattered by the consciousness that the power and majesty of God are already present in His person. Furthermore the original meaning of *basileia* is majesty as an exercise of power, not a kingdom as a realm of power.

The conclusions also which Schweitzer and Werner draw from their fundamental principle are doubtful. This is especially true of their treatment of the Mission Discourse in Mt 10. The disillusionment of Jesus, which they assert He experienced when the apostles returned and the world had not come to an end, has no support in the sources. Schweitzer's opinions on the course of Jesus' life are questionable, especially his claim that the Transfiguration preceded the confession of Peter and his interpretation of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem. One may also challenge Werner's thesis that the original community of Jerusalem, unlike Paul, consistently remained faithful to the Mosaic law; for the authenticity of Mt 5:18 is doubtful, and the original Christian community had no really clear fundamental position regarding the Law. Another incorrect assertion of Werner is his statement that Paul saw in Jesus "a lofty, angelic being (*hohes Engelwesen*)."—The substance of a present salvation, of a redemption already experienced, is greater and more important than the ideas which the "monomaniacs of thoroughgoing eschatology" wish to read out of the texts.—If Werner thinks the Hellenization of the gospel and, in general, the further history of dogma was the consequence of "deeschatologizing," we must term this view one-sided and exaggerated. "There is no such master key to history." The unfortunate results of Schweitzer's disdain of historical criticism (*Verachtung der Kritik*) and his excessive reliance on the Synoptics Mt and Mk are shown in his explanation of Mk 4:10-12 which he considers a genuine statement of Jesus. In reality it is none other than Mark who is "the creator of the cruel theory of a double predestination!" Recent utterances of Schweitzer prove that for him the historical construction of thoroughgoing eschatology is only a temporary *cadre* which does not touch the essence of the gospel truth.—J. Bz.

ARCHAEOLOGY

152. F. X. EGGERSDORFER, "Was wissen wir von der Herkunft des Turiner Grablinnens?" *Klerusblatt** 36 ('56) 161-163.

The defenders of the genuinity of the Turin Shroud (Siegmund, Bulst, Berna) are accustomed either to be silent about the ancient records or even to assert that they simply do not believe the unanimous testimony of these documents of bishops and popes and even of those who had charge of the Shroud. Actually a careful and unprejudiced study of the oldest documents shows beyond doubt that copies of the Shroud were made for the first time about the middle of the fourteenth century. "There are no 'relics of Christ,' whose [late] origin is so completely proved as that of the Turin Shroud. No eagerness or pious desire [to see that true image of Jesus], ('Is it Thou, Lord?'), should be allowed to conceal the truth. Only the truth can lead us to Christ" (p. 163). —W. K.

153. K. GALLING, "Erwägungen zur antiken Synagoge," *ZeitDeutschPal* 72 (2, '56) 163-178.

It is certain from the NT and other sources that there existed in the first century numerous synagogue-buildings, apparently not of a new style but of one already long rooted; compare Ethiopian Enoch 53,6; 46,8; Ps 137; hardly Ezek 11:6. The synagogue Tora-niche is exemplified in that substructure of the "Pinnacle of the Temple" which is popularly called "Solomon's Stables" or the "Jesus-Cradle." The niche-form developed organically out of its original shell-shape, uninfluenced by the Christian apse but more likely itself giving rise to the apse-form.—R. N.

154. B. GUSTAFSSON, "The Oldest Graffiti in the History of the Church?" *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 65-69.

In 1945, during excavations in a suburb of Jerusalem, graffiti, executed before A.D. 50, were found on two ossuaries. One read *Iesous Iou*, and the other *Iesous Aloth*. Are the quotations, as Sukenik suggested, laments on the Crucifixion? This is unlikely, as the Primitive Church based its faith on Jesus the risen, living Lord. Sukenik rightly translates the first as "Jesus Woe," but this could be not a lament, but a prayer for the deceased, "Jesus Help." Sukenik suggested that *Aloth* might be connected with the Hebrew for "complain." More likely it is a Greek transliteration of a Hebrew root meaning "arise," used here in a jussive sense. Thus we have, "Jesus, let (him who rests here) arise."—L. J.

155. B. M. METZGER, "New Light from Old Manuscripts," *Theology Today* 13 (1, '56) 72-86.

In 1945 at Nag Hammadi in Egypt were found thirteen papyrus volumes comprising more than a thousand pages, of which 794 were complete, and which preserved the text of 48 treatises. Written in Coptic, these documents constitute a Gnostic library probably collected during the third and fourth centuries A.D. Since the text of almost all of these treatises had been lost, the importance of the find can hardly be exaggerated. The publication of the text has unfortunately been delayed by a legal tangle regarding the ownership of the codices.

Another important discovery has been that of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In these one may mention four parallels to Christian writings. (1) The hymn at the end of the Manual of Discipline and the Benedictus. (2) Jn 1:3. (3) The correction of a brother (Mt 18:15 ff.) and (4) Paul's prohibition to take disputes before a civil judge (1 Cor 6:1-6). On the other hand the differences are great. Unlike the Qumran group the Church was not exclusive but universal, and it sought to bring in the Gentiles. Most important is the distinction between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness as regards their persons and work. Even the earliest strata of Gospel tradition contain the same high Christology which appears in the Fourth Gospel. "In Jesus there is found a

quiet recognition of his uniqueness, of being and doing what is attributable only to God Himself. There is no evidence, however, that the Teacher of Righteousness so regarded his person and work." In general the Qumran sect and early Christianity may be regarded as parallel but independent movements.—J. J. C.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

156. W. H. BROWNLEE, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 12-30.

The Teacher of Righteousness, father and founder of a new society, the "Devout Ones," speaks of "my covenant." Does Christ mean something similar by "my Church" in Mt 16:18? There is an excommunication discipline in Christianity (Mt 18:15 ff.) parallel to that of Qumran. Qumran throws light also on the concepts of the second Moses and the Davidic Messiah. In the Rule of the Congregation the Messiah of Israel presides with the priest at an eschatological banquet of bread and wine. There are further similarities here with the Last Supper. In the Collection of Blessings the Messiah is clearly Davidic. This Messiah is the "prince of all the congregation" of the Military Manual. The Suffering Servant motif is prominent. The Messiah's birth is painful, from the "crucible" of the womb (Zion?), and God refines him "more than the sons of men." He is the exemplar of that perfection sought by the Community. Qumran's Messianic concepts of moral purity, the spirit of truth, and purification through suffering are paralleled in the accounts of Jesus, especially St. John's, which makes the Passion a sanctification and a prior condition of Jesus' becoming fully the Christ.—L. J.

157. W. H. BROWNLEE, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTStud* 3 (3, '57) 195-210.

The Qumran Isaiah scroll shows Messianically charged variants; e.g., Isa 51:4-5, "my salvation." Such divine attributes become Messianic titles. So Lk 2:25-32; 1:69-75; 3:6; Jn 4:22 refer to Christ as God's salvation. The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* similarly refer to the Messiah as "Salvation," and the *Book of Jubilees* refers to the Messiah of Judah as the "salvation of Israel." In Mt's composite quotation on the occasion of our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Isaiah's "salvation" is united with Zechariah's "king." The Priest also is a Messianic figure. The blessing on the High Priest (1QSb) is Messianic at least in so far as it concerns the function and glory of the priesthood in the Messianic age. The amen acrostic of 1QS x.1-4 is connected with this by its priestly and Messianic references, however it is to be explained in detail. This then connects with various references to Christ in the NT: the bridegroom of Mt 25:1 ff.; Jn 2:1 ff.; the "amen" of 2 Cor 1:19-20; Col 1:15-19 and 2:8, 20; and much of the Apocalypse.—L. J.

158. J. DANIELOU, "Église primitive et communauté de Qumran," *Études** (May, '57) 216-235.

Relationships between the early Church and Essenism were *a priori* possible in view of (1) the duration of Qumran until 70, (2) the consequent dispersal of the Essenes to Damascus, Asia Minor, and Egypt, and (3) the evidence of Josephus that the Essenes were widespread. With Cullmann one can suppose that the group of converted Hellenist priests mentioned in Acts 6 were once Essenes; in support, the discourse of Stephen bears strong resemblances to the Damascus Document. Simon Magus, father of Gnosticism, might well have had contact with this group through his master Dositheus. The Essene parallels in Paul, the ex-Pharisee, such as the doctrine of justification in relation to the Law and the theme of light and darkness (especially in Acts 24), might have come about through contact with these former Essenes in Damascus. John could have known the converted Essenes either through his own association with the milieu of the Baptist or through later contacts in Asia Minor. Notable Johannine-Essene parallels occur in the mention of "the seal of God upon the forehead" in Apoc 7:3 and 9:4, in the conflict of light and darkness in John's Gospel and Epistles, and in the possible interpretation of Jacob's Well as a symbol of the Law (the well is the Law in the Damascus Document). The Epistle to the Hebrews, treating largely the question of the true priesthood, may have been addressed to converted Essene priests in Egypt. In this hypothesis the origin of certain works also becomes clear. The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, the *Didache*, the *Odes of Solomon* with their resemblance to the *Hodayot*, and the Epistles of Ignatius revealing typically Essene hierarchic organization, all emanate from the Church of Syria, which bore the effects of its converted Essene founders. With Audet one can also regard the *Shepherd of Hermas* as the work of a converted Essene in Rome. With all these relationships, however, Christ himself remains outside the sphere of Essene influence.—G. W. M.

159. J. DELORME, "Le Maître de Justice et Jésus," *AmiCler** 67 (7, '57) 97-102.

J. L. Bory in the *Express*, Dec. 7, 1956, finds analogies between the Community of the Alliance and primitive Christianity. The article is open to criticism on several points. First, we know more about Jesus than about the Master of Justice. We have some writings only from the latter, but we have the witness of the apostles concerning the life and teachings of Jesus. The disciples of the Master of Justice had a very high ideal of his mission, but it would be blasphemy for him to pose himself as a legislator above the Law as did Jesus. Whereas Christ accepted the title of Davidic Messiah and Son of God, the Master of Justice considered himself a fallible man and a sinner. His disciples, however, probably considered him the Messiah of Aaron. Was the Master of Justice executed? The texts seem to indicate this, but on closer examination they refer rather to the Wicked Priest than to the Master of

Justice. Possibly he was executed, but was he crucified? J. M. Allegro thinks he was, but a school of experts working on all the known texts found no indication to support this view. In the texts we may understand the fact of crucifixion, but we cannot find any allusion to connect it with the Master of Justice. Was he a savior of the world by his suffering? Perhaps, but the idea of expiation for the sins of the multitude was foreign to the Community of the Alliance. Between the Master of Justice and Jesus the Redeemer there exists a wide abyss.—J. D. L.

160. H. BARDTKE, "[Qumran] 39: Die Loblieder von Qumran IV," *Theol-LitZeit* 82 (5, '57) 339-348.

Reconstructed and annotated German translation of *Hodayôt* cols. 12-18.—R. N.

161. I. BEN-DOR, "The Jars of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *AmJournArch* 61 (2, '57) 181-182.

Despite current belief that the jars used for the Dead Sea Scrolls were jars of everyday life, nevertheless ancient literary evidence, the finding in Egypt of similar jars containing papyri, and the large quantities of jars found at the Dead Sea excavations, all seem to belie this. The original stand of the excavators, that the jars were made with the intention of storing the Scrolls, therefore appears to be correct.—R. B. C.

162. C. COLPE, "Die Essener und das Judenchristentum. Zu den Handschriftenfunden am Toten Meer," *Deutsche Universitätszeitung* 12 (5-6, '57) 20-23; (7, '57) 10-15.

After a careful account of the discovery and acquisition of the MSS and a survey of the contents of each one, C studies the question of the Qumran sect's relation to the Essenes: "The contents of the Scrolls and fragments are in such striking agreement with the ancient accounts of the Essenes that we should without hesitation identify the Qumran sect with them." Whatever may have been the influence of Essenism on Christianity, it is certain that Jesus and His followers were not Essenes; for along with the similarities noted by Dupont-Sommer, there are on major points essential differences. The distinctive message of the NT now emerges more clearly defined and distinct, and Christians not only have nothing to fear from Qumran; they could, in fact, wish nothing better than these writings which teach them to understand the milieu and the uniqueness of the origin of Christianity.—J. Bz.

163. E. L. EHRLICH, "Ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre der Qumransekte," *Zeit-AltWiss* 68 (4, '56) 234-243.

Although a definitive statement of the Messianic doctrine of Qumran is as yet impossible, the evidence disproves the notions that Jewish tradition knows

but one Messiah and that the priestly Messiah of Aaron ranks higher than the political Messiah of Israel. Various rabbinical writings and the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* show, without indication of rank, that a kingly Messiah and a priestly figure, often Elijah, are both expected. The order of seating and of blessings in the 1QSa fragment proves only that the Messiah of Israel was second to the high priest in the performance of the priestly function of blessing. Identifications of the Messiah of Israel of 1QS with the various figures mentioned in the other Scrolls are hypothetical, though often probable.—G. W. M.

164. J. P. HYATT, "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge," *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 1-12.

Where do we stand on the tenth anniversary of the initial discovery of the scrolls? There should be no debate regarding the genuineness of the MSS or the date for the principal materials. The evidence also permits us to call the Qumran sectaries "Essene" in the broad sense, but not Jewish Christians.

Regarding future studies in the Dead Sea materials, the following points may be made: (1) The discoveries may contribute much to the higher criticism of the OT, but indirectly. (2) They will be of tremendous value in the area of OT textual criticism. (3) The Covenanters arose before the differences between Pharisees and Sadducees had crystallized, and so they resemble both sects, but there was no generally recognized "orthodoxy." The apocalyptic-messianic element of Judaism is prominent before A.D. 70. (4) NT scholars, especially in America, have neglected the discoveries, partly because they are in unpointed Hebrew.

Apropos of Christian origins: (1) the discoveries will place more books of the NT (e.g., Fourth Gospel) upon Palestinian soil. (2) They tend to support Schweitzer's theory that early Christianity was an apocalyptic community, though there is an element of "realized eschatology" in the "messianic banquet" referred to in 1QSa. (3) The existence of the Essene communities seems to make it more probable that Jesus consciously established a "church." A comparative study should be made of Qumran and Christian terms for "community" and related notions. (4) It seems likely that Papias' reference to the Hebrew original of the logia of Matthew is to be taken literally. Similarly, the phrase found in Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14 may really mean Hebrew. (5) The *peshārīm* (apocalyptic works providing a key to the mysteries of OT passages) and the lists of prophetic *testimonia* manifest a free interpretation of the OT used also by the early Christians. (6) It is not necessary to suppose that John the Baptist, Jesus, or any of His closest disciples had been Essenes. But Essene ideas were current.

Concerning the originality or "truth" of early Christianity, it should be observed that: (1) the "truth" of the Christian faith rests not on the uniqueness of Jesus' teaching, but on belief in the Incarnation, a unique and unrepeatable event. Faith is not subject to historical verification. (2) The Judean Covenanters were a spiritual elite. The Christian scholar should not condemn in

them as narrow and legalistic what he praises as virtuous in a Christian group. Lastly, it is not true to say with Dupont-Sommer that Christianity was a "quasi-Essene neo-formation."—C. H. G.

165. L. JOHNSTON, "The B. B. C. and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Tablet** 209 ('57) 178.

Early in 1957 the B.B.C. presented three feature programs on the discovery, contents, and interpretation of the Scrolls. Recordings by the principal archaeologists and scholars in Europe, America, and Palestine were linked by the narrator's running comments. Particularly effective was a recording made in the eleventh Qumran cave, as also the reading of Qumran texts side by side with excerpts from Josephus. Some confusion was apparent over the various theories of the historical background of the Habakkuk Commentary, and the impression was given that major changes in our Bible text would result from the Qumran biblical material. On Qumran and Christianity, though the majority of experts declared that the Scrolls would involve no radical change in our concept of Christianity, the theories of Dupont-Sommer, Wilson, and Allegro were attractively presented and somewhat unduly stressed.—G. G.

166. E. OSSWALD, "Zur Hermeneutik des Habakuk-Kommentars," *ZeitAltWiss* 68 (4, '56) 243-256.

The Habakkuk Commentary is important for the history of hermeneutics as the oldest Jewish commentary. The method of the author may be described as typological-symbolic explanation. Elaborating on Elliger's statement of the hermeneutical principle involved—that prophecy deals with the end and that the present time is the final period—we find the following observations: (1) The Hab prophecy deals with the final period. (2) The revelation is a mystery, not fully understood by the prophet himself. (3) In the final period, which has already begun, God will reveal all the secrets of the prophets to the Teacher of Righteousness, (4) whose function will be to explain the full eschatological meaning of the prophecies. Comparisons show similar principles operative in Dan 9-12, the apocrypha, the NT (e.g. 1 Pt 1:10-12), and rabbinic writings. The Hab Commentary is thus an important link in a definite chain of hermeneutical tradition.—G. W. M.

167. C. RABIN, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees," *JournJewStud* 7 (1-2, '56) 3-11.

The Qumran peshar 4 QpNahum edited by J. Allegro in *JournBibLit* 75 ('56) 89-95, on Nah 2:12b (AV 11b) says "kings of the Greeks from Antiochus until the rulers of the Kittim took office." The (rulers of the) Kittim are therefore Romans. As Allegro claims, the words must refer to the punishment of those "interpreters of smooth things" who called in Demetrius Eukairos against Jannaeus 88 B.C.—and these were also enemies of the Qumran sect, which there-

fore was on Jannaeus' side. There is no basis in Josephus B 1,4,3 (A 13,13,5) or B 1,4,4 for the claim of Schürer and most that the Pharisees were the enemies of Jannaeus who invited Demetrius: the more especially since Josephus A 13,10,5 (though not B 1,2,8) does mention the Pharisees as enemies of John Hyrcanus. In fact Jannaeus had tiffs with the Pharisees, but only such as his hot temper prompted.—R. N.

168. B. J. ROBERTS, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Essenes," *NTStud* 3 (1, '56) 58-65.

Philo and Josephus seem to have misrepresented the doctrines of the Essenes (the Qumran Sectarians), especially those concerning Scripture, ethical standards, and sacrifice. Josephus maintains they use, inter alia, the "holy books"—presumably Scripture—for curing diseases and for predicting such events as the death of Archelaus. Philo, contrasting their method of study with that of the rabbis, calls it allegorical. But the Qumran approach to Scripture is apocalyptic. It is concerned with *peshet*—elucidation of oracles under direct divine inspiration. This is not allegory. Philo mentions their concern with ethical standards; but this concern is not an end in itself, only part of their submission to the covenant. An essential aspect of their life was atonement and expiation for others. Did they offer sacrifice? Josephus and Philo say no, the latter adding that they sanctified their minds instead. But they were instructed in Temple sacrifice, and their sanctification was ritualistic and sacerdotal. Sacrifice, therefore, was not excluded by them, but only made subordinate.—L. J.

169. C. ROTH, "The Teacher of Righteousness," *Listener* 57 (June 27, '57) 1037-1041.

The Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66-70 forms the historical setting of the Habakkuk Commentary. The Teacher of Righteousness was Menahem, the Zealot leader, son of Judah the Galilean, who, after seizing Masadah, was victorious over the Roman garrison at Jerusalem. Josephus describes him as a "sophist," which suggests a teacher or spiritual leader. The Wicked Priest was Eleazar, captain of the Temple guard, who attacked Menahem as he went up to the Temple and later executed him. The House of Absalom alludes to a certain Absalom, Menahem's most eminent supporter, who met a similar fate. Clearly the Qumran people were not Essenes, but Zealots, who reoccupied the site under Judah the Galilean about A.D. 6, and, after Menahem's death, continued resistance in the "republic of Masadah-Qumran" till A.D. 73. The two copper scrolls refer to the booty they seized at Jerusalem from the royal palaces and the Roman pay-chest, and possibly from the Temple itself. This theory clarifies further allusions in the Qumran literature: the Lion of Wrath was John of Gischala, hero of the defense of Jerusalem; the Kittim sacrificing to their standards refers to the conduct of the Roman legionaries in the Temple court after their capture of the city.—G. G.

170. K. SMYTH, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Furrow** 8 (4, '57) 215-223.

The publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the past few years has marked the beginning of a new era of biblical studies. Besides offering ancient Hebrew texts of the OT, they shed much light on the apocrypha, the nature of the Qumran sect, and the historical background of the NT.—P. C. W.

171. J. VAN DER PLOEG,* "The Meals of the Essenes," *JournSemStud* 2 (2, '57) 163-175.

Most authors, with the notable exception of W. Bauer, have held that the meals of the Essenes were "sacred meals." A meal may be called sacred when the food is properly holy and the eating itself is a sacred act. Such meals are the exception in any group and must be distinguished from ordinary meals that are merely "related to the 'holy'." Of the Essene meals, Philo stresses the fact that they were taken in common. Josephus gives an idealized description of them, pointing out the wearing of special clothes "as if they were holy" (really the practical matter of wearing clean clothes to the refectory), the comparative silence of Essene meals as contrasted with pagan meals, and the ritually pure and supervised preparation of the food. Nor is there any evidence from Qumran that the meals were sacred or that there was any sacrificial cult apart from the Temple. The archaeological evidence of animal bones buried carefully in jars simply poses the question: Did the Essenes regard animal bones as unclean and therefore guard against touching them? The fact that the meals were taken in common is no proof of their sacredness: it is logical for communities to eat together, and we know that the Ḥabērīm and the Therapeutae often met for common meals.—G. W. M.

172. E. VOGT, "Die Bundesgemeinde vom Toten Meer," *StimZeit** 160 (7, '56-'57) 28-43.

Our evidence as to the dwelling place of the Qumran community is abundant. They lived in the desert of Juda on the northwest bank of the Dead Sea. Remains of the central assembly halls surrounded by caves still exist. From the lack of coins in these caves and the abundance of them in the main halls, we may conclude that goods were held in common and not by individuals. The last historical trace of the community goes back to A.D. 68, when the people fled before the advancing Roman legions. The community was probably established around the Dead Sea about 100 B.C., but may have existed elsewhere prior to that time. The theological ideas of the Scrolls rest firmly on the basis of the OT and the Mosaic law. In the relationship of Qumran to Christianity, some have claimed that the Teacher of Justice was an exact prototype of Jesus. One of many reasons why this is not true is the absence of a redemptive death in the life of the Teacher. According to Prof. Burrows, "There is no trace of a gospel with the Teacher of Justice as its focal point." The many similarities that exist between the Scrolls and the NT both in idea and expression show us how deeply Jesus and His disciples were rooted in the Palestinian world.

Certainly Jesus, and especially John, knew of the Qumran community, yet, the baptism of John is entirely different from the merely ritualistic washings of the Qumran community. John prepared the way for the "Mighty One," who was already among His people. The Qumran people were waiting expectantly for the end of time, neglecting Him who came into the world, to whom John bore witness. The great significance of Qumran literature rests in the insight it gives into the life of a religious movement before and at the time of Christ.—N. F. D.

173. N. WIEDER, "Notes on the New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran," *JournJewStud* 7 (1-2, '56) 3-11.

Midraš Sifre on Deut 21:22 "thou shalt hang him [up alive]" parallels J. Allegro's comment on the Qumran Pešer to Nahum 2:13 (*JournBibLit* 75 ['56] 91), and hence Rowley's doubt that crucifixion is implied is unjustified. Also in Sifre Deut 11:22 "Great Ones" means leaders. In *JournBibLit* 75 ('56) 175, Allegro's text on Gen 49:10 eliminates the very basis of Justin's anti-Jewish interpretation and seems possibly to have been composed expressly *against* Justin! The 4Q Testimonia on Deut (*JournBibLit* 75 ['56] 182-6) include a lesson drawn from 1 Kgs 16:34 (Hiel) on how [predictive] prophecies are fulfilled.—R. N.

174. R. McL. WILSON, "Simon, Dositheus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Zeit-RelGeist* 9 (1, '57) 21-30.

How can we account for the transition from a pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism (Cullmann, *JournBibLit* 74 ['55] 213) to the radically anti-Jewish attitude of many of the later Gnostic systems? Schubert (*TheolLitZeit* ['56] 495) is not successful in making the *Serek ha-Yahad* Gnostic; nor is Kuhn (*ZeitTheol-Kir* '52) in making the Scrolls an anti-Gnostic OT-NT tradition. Simon Magus, controvertibly called Father of Gnosticism, can be linked with Qumran via Dositheus, the "father of the Sadducees [i.e. Damascus-Zadokite sect]"; but there are some twenty persons named "Dositheus," and the heresiarch is rather Samaritan than Essene. We await further data; e.g. the Nag Hammadi "Apocalypse of Dositheus."—R. N.

175. S. ZEITLIN, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fantasies and Mistranslations," *Jew-QuartRev* 48 (1, '57) 71-85.

After a detailed criticism of recent books and articles on Qumran in the light of a thorough study of pertinent Jewish writings, Z reaffirms his thesis that the Scrolls were written in the Middle Ages by semi-literate Jews, perhaps cranks.—P. C. W.

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

(The asterisk is not employed in this section.)

The present issue of BOOKS AND OPINIONS has been prepared by the following: J. B. Coll (Ed.), J. F. Bresnahan, J. L. Connor, H. A. Levy, R. L. Richard, R. L. Twomey, J. N. Tylenda.

NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS

BOOK:

176r. H. SCHÜRMANN, *Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk. 22, 19-20. II Teil einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk. 22, 7-38*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, hrg. von M. Meinertz, XX. Band, 4. Heft. (Münster/Westf.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955, broschiert DM 10,80), xii and 153 pp.

In the first part of his projected trilogy, reviewed in *CathBibQuart* 16 ('53) 262-263, S concluded that Lk 22:15-18 represents a slightly edited form of a very early source. In this second volume, he proceeds to apply the same source-theory to the words of institution, Lk 22:19-20. Since he finds no dependence of Lk on Mt, S confines himself to an extremely close comparison of the other institution texts, Lk 22:19-20; Mk 14:22-24; 1 Cor 11:23-25, and arrives at the following conclusions.

Contrary to widely accepted views, Luke's institution account is not a borrowing from Mk, far less from 1 Cor, nor is it an adaptation from liturgical sources; rather it represents the oldest and most accurate rendition of a primitive, written institution account. Paul used the same source, but expanded it for instructional purposes.

OPINION:

177r. All the reviewers consulted have high praise for the care and scholarship reflected throughout the work at hand. Says C. F. D. Moule in *JournTheolStud* N.S. 6-7 (1955-1956) 112-113: "The Lucan Institution Narrative, so often treated as a Cinderella, is claimed to be a royal child." A. Viard in *Rev-SciencPhilThéol* 40 (1, '56) 163-164 remarks that, though one does not have to accept all S's conclusions, the reader "will find here one of the most conscientious studies of the traditions and texts that have transmitted to us the record of the institution of the Eucharist." J. Schmid in *MünchTheolZeit* 7 (2, '56) 159-160 observes, however, with regard to S's refusal to see a liturgical influence on Luke's text, that "one cannot disregard the fact that the NT accounts of the Last Supper would be bound to have their *Sitz im Leben* in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. So even the written source for Luke's account . . . cannot have been independent of the celebration." J. L. McKenzie in *CathBibQuart* 17 (3, '55) 528-529 finds the argument, though "close" and "solidly founded in lexicography," at times "a little strained—for instance, when S. finds a difference between Lk 22, 19b and I Cor 11, 24b, although the two phrases are

verbally identical." P. Benoit in *RevBib* 63 (3, '56) 460-461 points out that S's thesis not only proposes a purer literary form of the institution account, but indicates the presence of an older theology, namely that of "the servant who gives his life to found the new alliance, according to themes from Isaiah and Jeremiah . . . whereas Mark's text, with its 'blood of the alliance' and its rigorous parallelism of the two elements, suggests rather Ex., XXIV, 8 and a notion of sacrificial oblation." E. Schweizer in *TheolLitZeit* 81 (4, '56) 217-219 had already written in agreement on the priority of the Luke and Paul texts; he lists some remaining difficulties with S's argumentation.

BOOK:

178r. A. WIKENHAUSER, *Die Christusmystik des Apostels Paulus*. Zweite, umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage (Freiburg i. Br., Herter: 1956, Leinwand, 8.80 DM), xii and 172 pp.

Die Christusmystik des hl. Paulus, first edition of this work, appeared in *Biblische Zeitfragen* (12. Folge, Heft 8-10, Münster, Aschendorff) in 1928. The present edition, showing careful revision in the light of much new material, puts forward the same fundamental theses. The elusive *Mystik* is defined as that form of piety which seeks, or possesses already, immediate union with God. By *Christusmystik*, W understands the mysterious union of the Christian with the Person of the risen Christ, as expressed in the Pauline formulas "in Christ" and "Christ in us." The union is a physical-accidental one, effected *uniquely* through baptism, though faith is an indispensable presupposition for the union.

Comparing Pauline *Mystik* with the various pagan mysticisms, W finds Paul's "union" altogether distinct from pantheistic identification of the soul with God. Hellenistic mysticism, moreover, knew no eschatology in the Judaeo-Christian sense, nor was it interested in an ethical factor, whereas Paul makes much, if not all, of his ethic flow directly from the realities of his *Mystik*.

OPINION:

179r. The reviewers commend W's scholarship and the improvements of the second edition. A few discuss the difficulties that must inevitably accompany use of the word *Mystik*, but are willing to accept W's definition of it. In particular: A. Kleinhaus in *Antonianum* 32 (1, '57) 74-75 gives an excellent outline of the contents of the book. J. Reuss in *TheolRev* 53 (1, '57) 13-14 sees it an "important contribution to biblical, and especially Pauline theology." J. Schneider in *TheolLitzeit* 82 (2, '57) 109-110 finds W's conclusions so well-considered "that they will . . . find wide acceptance." Schelkle in *TheolQuart* 136 (4, '56) 486 remarks that W's book is "more than just the presentation of a part of Pauline theology. For precisely *this* part is a basic element (*Kernstück*) of Pauline Christianity and of Christian faith and life by and large." Brinkmann in *Scholastik* 32 (2, '57) 310 gives an approving summary of the contents, but mentions that "no doubt through an oversight the . . . works of K. Prümm, S.J., are nowhere mentioned." P. Gaechter in *ZeitKathTheol* 79 (2, '57) 236-237 refers the reader to his review of the first edition, in *ZeitKathTheol* 53 ('29) 601-605, and insists: "The real problem lies in the question: What is *Das Sein*

in Christo in its inner nature? W. answers as he did before: a dynamic union." But "every creature exists in dynamic union with the Creator, without any mystical union having been effected. The solution . . . is again not given in the second edition." In a very brief review, D. E. L. in *Irénikon* 29 (3, '56) 331 complains, "The pages relative to eschatology and the return of Christ might have merited a more ample development." Notice is given the book, also, by A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 262-263.

BOOK:

180r. E. J. GOODSPEED, *The Key to Ephesians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, \$2.50), xvi and 75 pp.

G repeats his earlier (*The Meaning of Ephesians* and *Introduction to the New Testament*) theory on the origin of Eph; namely, that an admirer of Paul, prompted by an enthusiastic reading of Acts, collected and copied for publication nine letters of Paul to seven churches. By way of a preface, this admirer composed Eph, to show how Paul's doctrines applied to the present needs of the Church.

In support of his theory, G prints the entire English text of Eph in column fashion, with parallels from Col and other Pauline Epistles in adjoining columns. His "clues" to non-Pauline authorship are presented in substantially the same form as in his earlier writings, with a few new arguments.

OPINION:

181r. C. W. F. SMITH in *AnglTheolRev* 39 (2, '57) 196 thinks "this will be a useful book for students who do not know Greek whether they follow Goodspeed or not." For F. V. Filson in *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 72, "It is a joy to witness the continuing vigor of this noted NT scholar." M. Barth in *Christ-Cent* 74 (1, '57) 18 complains that "the discussion between H. Schlier and E. Percy concerning gnosticizing material, as well as other disputes about the *kerugma* of Ephesians, is not even mentioned," but B considers the use of parallel columns of texts "new and important." He warns that the book "will offer no key—historical, literary or theological"—to the understanding of the unique message of Eph, which is "the relation of the Church to the world under the same 'head.'" C. Burke in *CathBibQuart* 18 (4, '56) 465 finds it "regrettable" that G does not sufficiently consider the difficulties that militate against his conclusion concerning the authorship of Eph.

GOSPELS .

BOOK:

182r. X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *Concordance des Évangiles Synoptiques* (Paris-Tournai: Desclée et Cie., 1956, 520 fr.) 20 pp. *Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels*, trans. Robert J. O'Connell (New York: Desclée Co., Inc., 1957, \$2.00) 21 pp. and 3 folders.

This concordance comprises a pamphlet and three folders printed in seven

colors, each folder representing one of the Synoptics and each having its proper color chosen from the primary colors (Mt—red; Mk—blue; Lk—yellow). To show that a given passage is common to two or more Evangelists, the combination of the primary colors is used (Mt-Mk—violet; Mk-Lk—green; Lk-Mt—orange; Mt-Mk-Lk—brown). By this clever and wise use of colors and appropriate symbols, the reader can readily see how a given passage compares with other parallel passages in respect to identity or diversity.

OPINION:

183r. All reviewers remark about L-D's wise choice in using colors to represent each Evangelist or a combination of Evangelists. P. Lamarche in *Études* (5, '57) 291 calls this concordance very objective and rich in details; it should prove to be an excellent instrument in Synoptic studies. The reviewer in *Bib-VieChrét* 17 ('57) 124 adds that through these colors the reader is immediately and accurately brought to the Synoptic problem without having any definite solution imposed upon him. J. L. D'Aragon in *SciencEccl* 9 (2, '57) 185-187 gives more detail concerning the superiority of L-D's work to previous attempts. L-D's concordance is better than A. Barr's *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships* (Edinburgh 1938; reprinted 1949) because (1) it uses seven colors rather than B's five; (2) the folders permit more convenient handling than B's large charts. This last reviewer recognizes this concordance as a work of patience and care both on the part of the author and editor, remarking that the list of *corrigenda* is relatively brief. J. Sint in *ZeitKathTheol* 79 (2, '57) 233 asserts that in this excellent introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, L-D's striking arrangement of the Gospels offers many observations otherwise missed in the ordinary printed text. Cf. favorable reviews by F. Refoulé in *VieSpir* 97 (430, '57) 80 and A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 257.

BOOK:

184r. J. GUITTON, *Le Problème de Jésus et les fondements du témoignage chrétien*, La Pensée moderne et le Catholicisme, VI (Paris: Aubier, 1950), 262 pp.

J. GUITTON, *Le Problème de Jésus: Divinité et Résurrection*, La Pensée moderne et le Catholicisme, VII (Paris: Aubier, 1953), 272 pp.

J. GUITTON, *The Problem of Jesus*, trans. A. G. Smith (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1955, \$3.75; London: Burns Oates, 1955, 21s).

G has written two volumes on *Le Problème de Jésus* in the series *La Pensée moderne et le Catholicisme*. The English title above is a translation of an abridgement of G's two French volumes on *Le Problème de Jésus*, made by the author. This is an apologetic work of an original sort. It is a "logic of religion" with scientific cogency. G believes that the fundamental problem of Christianity is situated at the junction of philosophy and history. Hence he attempts to render explicit his deepest reasons for belief both as a philosopher and as an historian. The divisions of the book are: (1) Faith and Intelligence, (2) Jesus and Thought, (3) The Church and the Gospel.

OPINION:

185r. The *London Times* reviewer in *TimesLitSupp* 54 (Aug. 19, '55) 481 sees here a startling work, forceful and original, but would like more attention given to the *formgeschichtliche* school. A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 39 ('55) 295 also compliments G on his originality and cogency of argument. B. M. G. Reardon in *Theology* 53 (416, '55) 72 calls the book "characteristic of what is best in French scholarship." P. Benoit in *RevBibl* 63 (3, '56) 433 and K. Foster in *Blackfriars* 37 (435, '56) 274 both praise G's learned contribution.

BOOK:

186r. V. TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (London: Macmillan, 1954, 12s. 6d.), xii and 236 pp.

V. TAYLOR, *The Life and Teachings of Jesus* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, \$3.00), 237 pp.

This is the second installment of a projected trilogy on the Person of Jesus. The book opens with an evaluation of the documentary sources of the Gospels and their reliability, concluding that they are surely historical. The remainder is devoted to a reconstruction of the actual life of Christ, depending largely on Mk, bolstered by Johannine tradition. T feels that "we do not see the Christ of faith except in the light of the Jesus of history."

OPINION:

187r. Reviewers are in general very favorable. L. A. Garrard in *JournTheol-Stud* 6 (1, '55) 270 calls this study valuable and important but notes that many will not completely agree with T unless they espouse his religious convictions. T. S. Kepler in *JournBibLit* 74 (3, '55) 203 commends the freshness of style, coupled with the soundness of scholarship. P. H. Igarashi in *JournRel* 35 (4, '55) 257 recommends the book without hesitation, but questions whether T's deep personal faith and piety unduly influence his judgment on occasion. The expression of a similar fear—"thinking under the church bells"—is found in the review of *ExpTimes* 66 (3, '54) 66. The *London Times* reviewer in *TimesLit-Supp* 54 (Jan. 7, '55) 13 feels, however, that T is thoroughly objective and unbiased. A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 56 (1, '56) 147 is favorable, though reserved, in his treatment. The book is also well reviewed by J. A. T. Robinson in *NTStud* 2 (2, '55) 148.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

BOOK:

188r. O. CULLMANN, *The State in the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956, \$2.50), ix and 123 pp.

Der Staat im Neuen Testament (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1956, DM 8), vii, 84 S. Kart.

The problem of Church and State is inherent in the NT and finds therein its Christian solution. This solution follows as a corollary of the eschatological attitude of early Christianity, a chronological dualism which sees the End Time

as fulfilled in Christ, but with its consummation yet in the future. While the framework of this world endures, the State has a "provisional" function. Nowhere in the NT is there either denial of the State or, on the other hand, uncritical acceptance of the State; and this accounts for the seeming contradictions.

The position of Jesus himself must be read against the background of contemporary Zealotism. Of his disciples, one, Simon, certainly at least had been a Zealot, Judas Iscariot probably so, Peter and the sons of Zebedee possibly. For Jesus, "the zealot ideal constituted the true temptation." In this setting, Jesus' personal attitude is fundamentally dual: He does not regard the State as final and is critical of it; but He accepts it and renounces any violence planned against it. Moreover, and despite His Messianic consciousness, Jesus resists all Zealotist temptations. Yet, because His attitude toward the State is necessarily dual, complex, the Jews are able to distort His meaning and denounce Him. Ultimately, it is as a Zealot that Jesus is condemned by the Romans to crucifixion.

In Paul, there is no change of attitude. The same dualism perdures, as it does also in the Johannine Apocalypse. Rom 13, when analyzed in context and when set alongside 1 Cor 6:1 and 2:8, cannot be adduced as authorizing blind, uncritical acceptance of the State. Nor is there contradiction, on the side of condemnation, in the Johannine Apocalypse (13), but merely exclusive preoccupation with the Roman State precisely insofar as it had become totalitarian by demanding the abomination of Emperor Worship.

[In a final excursus, C defends his position that *exousiai* in Rom 13:1 refers simultaneously both to the State and to the angelic powers behind it. Article first published in *TheolZeit*, 1954, 321-336.]

OPINION:

189r. As many of the reviewers pointed out, a book which claimed to find in the NT a definitive and permanently applicable Christian solution to the problem of Church and State was bound to be received with considerable interest. Some of the reviewers contented themselves with expository analysis, adding little if anything of comment; but even in these, general approval, at least of the main lines of the thesis, is easily inferred. J. Levie in *NouvRev-Théol* 89 (5, '57) 529 praises C for his clarity, logic, and attempt at theological synthesis. While he cannot agree with some particular exegeses, e.g., of Rom 13:1, he is very favorable to others, e.g., of Mt 12:13. He believes, moreover, that C's final synthesis of Christ's personal attitude stands firm on the block of texts taken into account. At the end of his review, L indicates that there remains another dimension to this whole problem, that of reflection on the part of human reason, especially as illumined by the analogy of faith. For J. Mulders, writing in *Bijdragen* 18 (2, '57) 182, the angelic powers behind the State—he accepts this exegesis of the *exousiai*—seem to be tending toward release from their subjection to God when the State itself acts according to the principle of retribution. Nor can he accept C's position that the State should

not be Christian, a position he attributes to C's recognition of the dualism proper to the present order as one between "now" and the "future," and not also as a tension between "here" and the "beyond."

190r. The reviewer in *NovTest* 1 (3, '56) 231 feels that C makes too much of the Zealotist background, and is unable to accept the double meaning of *exousiai*. W. den Boer in *VigChrist* 11 (1, '57) 53, on the other hand, does accept this exegesis, but would like C's answer, as a theologian, to the question whether Rom 13:1, read in the light of belief in these powers, now presents merely a philologico-historical, or also a theological, meaning for the Christian faith. K. Schelkle in *TheolQuart* 136 ('56) 352 argues from the Stoic terminology of the context that in Rom 13 Paul is not talking about the Christian specifically, though the Apostle's eschatological dualism does show in other, and Christian, contexts. S also questions the pessimistic interpretation of Christ's judgment on the exercise of regal power in Lk 22:25. M.-E. Boismard in *RevBib* 64 (2, '57) 297 praises the author for his usual clarity and depth, finds interesting the thesis that Jesus was condemned as a Zealot by the Roman authority. M. Barth in *ChristCent* 73 (49, '56) 1423 writes that several points in this discussion call for further investigation. B underscores that C "has certainly shown that Heilsgeschichte, Jesus Christ himself—and not natural law—are basic to the NT's various yet harmonious teachings about the state." (Cf. Levie's remark above.) J. Knox in *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 70 considers that C has had no difficulty in establishing his general thesis. K believes, however, that the great difference in total attitude between Rom 13 and Apoc 13 needs much more attention. On the other side, K takes the first two chapters of the book as making an "important contribution to our understanding of the political situation in Palestine in the early first century and of Jesus' place within it."

191r. Though J. Bruns in *CathBibQuart* 18 (4, '56) 459 states that the timeliness of the volume makes it a welcome contribution, he takes rather vigorous exception to several points: C's argument that many disciples were or had been Zealots does not carry conviction; the present trend makes them more sympathetic to Essenism, which Josephus says regarded civil authority as acting in God's name. Is it true, B continues, that Christ was condemned by the Romans as a Zealot? Pilate knew Jesus was no Zealot, and John's narrative suggests rather contempt for the Jews as the Roman's motive in the cross inscription. Again, does Christianity reject the Jewish theocratic ideal as satanic? In His temptation, Christ rejected temporal power for Himself, and as from the devil, but not *in se*. Nor does C prove that between Church and State, as being irreconcilable orders, no union is possible. Nor is 1 Cor 6:1 really comparable to Rom 13:1; the former does not correct "the apparent endorsement of political authority" in the latter. Also, "it seems futile to look in Ap for any general principles governing Church-State relationships." Finally, "one puts aside this book with the impression that the author sees in the State—every and any State—merely the necessary alternative to anarchy." The reviewer in *Exp-Times* 68 (9, '57) 297 commences his lengthy and painstaking analysis with a

tribute to C's "profound erudition and facile pen." T. Gilby in *LifeSpir* 12 (134, '57) 94 gives a fresh summary of the argument, which he considers a judiciously presented discussion of this aspect of the Church and State problem. A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 269 takes brief notice of the book, commending its timeliness and originality of treatment.

BOOK:

192r. O. CULLMANN, *Immortalité de l'Ame ou Résurrection des Morts?*, (Neuchâtel-Paris: Delachaux-Niestlé, 1956, Fr. s.3) 86 pp.

[The body of this little book originally appeared as an article in the *Mélanges de Karl Barth*.] For the Greeks, especially the Platonists, immortality meant the end of all bodily encumbrance. Death was a liberation, and marked the entrance into a state of existence that was hardly the continuation of one's earthly self. For the Christians, death is a catastrophe, the result of sin—a catastrophe, however, conquered in the death and Resurrection of Christ. But the Christian resurrection of the dead is not a liberation from the body; it is the eternal perpetuation of the same identical person.

OPINION:

193r. While C's reputation as a scholar has assured this book a respectful hearing, comment in general seems to have been a bit reserved and something less than enthusiastic. An exception may be J. Coppens writing in *EphTheol-Lov* 33 (2, '57) 372, who believes that Catholics can subscribe almost without reserve to all of C's conclusions, and is surprised at the scandal caused to so many Protestant readers. He feels that of all the complaints, only that against the author's use of *sommeil* for the intermediate state between death and the resurrection of the body should excite any astonishment, and that even this interpretation can be defended. L. Bushinski in *CathBibQuart* 19 (2, '57) 291, pointing to the strong Platonic influence in C's analysis of immortality, comments that "if we accept his (C's) limited definition of the term 'immortality of the soul,' we would also admit that the NT rather speaks of resurrection from the dead than immortality of the soul." R. Rouquette in *Études* 293 (5, '57) 297 thinks that C takes the "dormition" image too literally, and in general underplays the legitimate role of philosophical reflection on the question of immortality. B. Willaert in *CollBrugGand* 3 (1, '57) 118 considers this work a suggestive study on the difference between the Greek and the Christian idea of immortality, but he does not believe that the opposition between the two is quite so emphatic as C has made it out. Brief notice is also taken by A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 269.

BOOK:

194r. J. HÉRING, *A Good and a Bad Government According to the New Testament* (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1954, \$2.75), 68 pp.

This richly bound monograph discusses what should be the attitude of today's Christian toward the state. Problems analyzed include the duty of the state

to favor the good and punish the wicked, the question of individual obedience once the state has gone beyond its rights, and the grounds of the Church's opposition to communistic society.

OPINION:

195r. M. E. BOISMARD in *RevBib* 63 (1, '56) 147-148 finds the study clear and precise, but feels that the NT allows considerable liberty of thought and action on what exactly should be the Christian's attitude toward the state. P. Nober in *VerbDom* 34 (5, '56) 317 observes that H seems to put forth as Scripture some reflections of his own national and political mentality. Brief notice is also given by the reviewer in *ExpTimes* 66 (4, '55) 108.

BOOK:

196r. T. F. TORRANCE, *Kingdom and Church: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956, 16s.), viii and 168 pp.

T's aim is to examine the eschatological thought of Luther, Bucer, and Calvin, with the hope that such study "may well serve to bring into closer understanding the Lutheran and Reformed Churches" (preface).

OPINION:

197r. In their appreciation of the careful learning and "royal abundance of citation" of this book the reviewers are unanimous. P. Benoit in *RevBib* 64 (2, '57) 298 finds chapter 1 an oversimplification of medieval theology but chapters 2-4, the heart of the book, deserving of careful reading. T presents the thought of the three Reformers as eschatologies of faith, love, and hope; the *London Times* reviewer in *TimesLitSupp* (May 17, '57) 308 believes T is aware that the distinction between kingdom and Church "cannot fully be maintained and is useful only in a most general sense." G. Rupp in *ExpTimes* 68 (6, '57) 169 declares eschatology an inadequate key to Luther, T overeager to claim Bucer for the Reformed tradition, and the essay on Calvin most successful. For P. Nober in *VerbDom* 34 (6, '56) 373-375 the book as a whole is an "accurate and marvellously condensed introduction to the theology of the 'reformers,'" but *in singulis* it belongs more to dogmatic theology and its history than to exegesis; he finds insufficient critical examination of some of the Reformers' biblical interpretations.

BOOK:

198r. T. F. TORRANCE, *Royal Priesthood*, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1955, 9s.), ix and 108 pp.

All the baptized form one body which participates in the royal priesthood of Christ. Among them is an order of priests serving the Gospel and Eucharist. The episcopate is not a separate order but a gift for supervising the clergy and signifying unity.

OPINION:

199r. T's interpretation of texts and incidents in Sacred Scripture is sharply criticized by several reviewers: A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 40 (1, '56)

168, who also finds T's conclusions going beyond the domain of biblical theology; C. Spicq in *FreiZeitPhilTheol* 4 (2, '57) 204; C. Ceroke in *CathBibQuart* 18 (2, '56) 222-223. How, asks Ceroke, can T justify deriving his concept of Christian priesthood principally from the OT and that without mentioning Melchizedek? "Verbalism" is his description of T's "corporate priesthood, . . . a word belonging to all, but a reality possessed by none." The assertion that the Holy Office denied to Catholics faith in the parousia is "unbelievably naive." For G. Herbert, however, in *Theology* 59 (430, '56) 172-173 T has come up with many fine observations, which space alone prevents this reviewer from detailing. Cf. also D. Lialine in *Irénikon* 29 (4, '56) 457-458.

BOOK:

200r. W. K. GROSSOUW, *Bijbelse Vroomheid. Beschouwingen over de spiritualiteit van het Nieuwe Testament*. (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1954), 240 pp.

W. K. GROSSOUW, *Biblische Frömmigkeit. Betrachtungen zum Geist des Neuen Testamentes*, trans. O. Karrer (Munich: Ars Sacra, 1956, 8.40 DM), 240 pp.

The sixteen chapters of this book are the result of a series of lectures given by the author at the University of Nimwegen. Its purpose is to give a biblical foundation for practical Christian piety; hence, theory and dogma play a secondary role in the book. Typical concepts of the Synoptics, of St. Paul, and of St. John are discussed in that order.

OPINION:

201r. F. WULF in *GeistLeb* 30 (1, '57) 74 concurs with G. Philips in *Eph-TheolLov* 31 (Sept., '55) 449 who thinks that "the themes of G are very original, even paradoxical, but written by an expert who is entirely at home in exegesis." P is surprised, however, that there is no chapter devoted to prayer. He disapproves of G's statement that "good self love" is the basis for love of neighbor and of God, and that Communism is an "unconscious Christianity." T. Schäfer in *BenMon* 33 (5-6, '57) 246-247 "in no wise intends to place the worth of the whole in question" when he takes exception to several points of exegesis, especially on 2 Cor 5:21 and Rom 7. Cf. also P. Grech in *Biblica* 38 (1, '57) 79.

BOOK:

202r. G. DIDIER, *Désintéressement du Chrétien. La rétribution dans la morale de saint Paul* (Paris: Aubier, 1955, 840 Fr.), 254 pp.

In response to critics, ranging from Kant to Thorez and our present day Communists, the motive for whose conduct is a selfless dedication to the state, D attempts to evaluate the place of retribution as a motive for Christian morality. Is the Christian merely a clever calculator of his own best interests (hope-fear), or does he rise to a selfless and "disinterested" motive: pure love of God? D concludes that, far from preaching a solely mercenary motivation, Paul reconciled and united these seemingly contradictory types of motiva-

tion. For it is not any exterior thing, but a person, Jesus Christ, whom the Christian hopes to possess and fears to lose. The Christian seeks merely a more perfect consummation of the union initiated in baptism, thereby transforming *eros* (self interest) into *agape* (selfless love, gratuitous service of God).

OPINION:

203r. D. MOLLAT in *RechScienceRel* 45 (2, '57) 257-261 praises the book, but questions some interpretations and the neglect of the eschatological character of wisdom. M, along with J. Sint in *ZeitKathTheol* 79 (2, '57) 238, regrets also the slight treatment accorded to the intrinsic morality of "interested" or selfish motivation in St. Paul. W. Seibel in *GeistLeb* 30 (1, '57) 75-76 commends D's "objective and painstaking" approach. "The essential thesis of the book has been proved true beyond a doubt." He regrets that D shows no familiarity with the recent *Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu* (Munich, 1955) by W. Pesch. R. Vigneault in *SciencEccl* 9 (1, '57) 87-89 commends D's "objective and scholarly study" of this very timely topic. S. del Paramo in *EstEcl* 31 (120, '57) 98-99, G. Ghysens in *BibVieChrét* 17 ('57) 121-122, and H. Rowley in *Exp-Times* 68 (9, '57) 285-286 look favorably upon D's well-established contribution.

EARLY CHURCH

BOOK:

204r. H. SCHLIER, *Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge* (Freiburg: Herder, 1956, DM 22), 322 pp.

These twenty-one essays written between 1932 and 1955, all but one previously published, focus on the Church as seen in the NT. The sequence of the essays follows the order of their original publication.

Of two main themes, the first considers the world before Christ's Church flourished in either pagan or Jewish lands. The second examines the spread of the Church, with observations on the canon of Scripture, episcopal authority, and the Church as found in Pauline writings. This last constitutes a formal study. S finds the key to the full significance of the Church in the Incarnation as the birth of the Church and the peak of NT times.

OPINION:

205r. Both P. BENOIT in *RevBib* 64 (2, '57) 296-297 and the reviewer in *BenMon* 33 (5/6, '57) 255 praise S's accurate exegesis which offers a deep insight into the sanctity of the Church and its consciousness of the eschatological situation. O. Kruss in *TheolGlaub* 46 (6, '56) 462 feels that not only has S clearly isolated the Church's unique mission perceptible in all its diverse activity, but also that he has accurately caught the tone of piety and devotion in the Apostolic Church. However, K. Schelkle in *TheolQuart* 136 (3, '56) 354 intimates that the author's convincing exegesis might occasionally imply that the NT is to be judged and evaluated from the milieu of the primitive Church rather than from the Church's authority. This might suggest the untenable position that the Church was established after the canon of Scripture. M. Meinertz in *TheolRev* 52 (4/5, '56) 171-172 realizes that S has employed

scholarly control over all his material. P. Gaechter in *ZeitKathTheol* 79 (2, '57) 237-238 praises the spiritual sensitivity of the tenth essay ("The Church according to the Epistle to the Ephesians"), but believes that S has read into the text mystical ideas which are not really Pauline. Even though a few passages are obscure in their theological language, G maintains, this volume is a substantial contribution to NT exegesis. Cf. also A. Viard in *RevScienc-PhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 271-272 for a favorable review.

BOOK:

206r. J. KNOX, *The Early Church and the Coming Great Church* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, \$2.50), 160 pp.

Professor Knox finds a remarkable resemblance between the early Church and the Church of today: unity in life and faith, disunity of organization, and an "ecumenical movement" of the second century corresponding to that of our day. From this second-century Christianity, sprung from tendencies implicit in the primitive Church, we already accept the norms of creed and Scripture canon. K pleads for the same status for episcopacy, the third mark of the Church of that era.

OPINION:

207r. The reviewers are unanimous in their praise of this book. They are P. Igarashi in *JournRel* 35 (4, '55) 257; the editorial writer of the *ExpTimes* 66 (9, '55) 257-258; H. Willoughby in *JournBibLit* 75 (3, '56) 240-241; J. Nelson in *Ecumenical Review* 8 (3, '56) 339-340; and V. de Waal in *Theology* 59 (427, '56) 36.

NEW TESTAMENT BACKGROUND

BOOK:

208r. E. R. GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Bollingen Series, XXXVII, 6 vols. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953-1956, vols. 1-3 \$25.00, vol. 4 \$7.50, vols. 5-6 \$15.00), 1324 pp.

The assembly and interpretation of ancient Jewish symbols form the content of this work. Believing that two separate trends, rabbinic and popular, existed in ancient Judaism, G gathers the pagan symbols accepted by the popular element and interprets their mystic symbolism. G finds symbolism everywhere, refusing to accept anything as merely decorative. He affirms that all Jewish symbols are basically erotic. Christianity, he believes, later received these symbols. Making use of recent findings in depth psychology, G applies them to both Jewish and Christian symbolism. G collects archaeological evidence from tombs and synagogues in Palestine, Rome and the Diaspora. The third volume contains 1209 plates to accompany the text of the first two volumes. The fourth volume, perhaps the most important, discusses his methodology. The fifth and sixth cover the mystic symbolism behind fish, bread, and wine. Discussing pagan and Jewish significances, he holds that the borrowing is on the side of Judaism.

OPINION:

209r. Many of the following reviews were published before G completed his work. Only R. North in *Orientalia* treats all six volumes thoroughly. Nearly all reviewers feel that G has done an immense service for Scripture professors and students specializing in this field. Nearly all, too, object to some of G's interpretations, particularly to the universal claim: no symbol is merely decorative. R. North in *Orientalia* 25 (3, '56) 310-314 and in *Orientalia* 26 (2, '57) 180-181 praises G's scientific accuracy and astonishing bibliography and criticizes G's theories on decorativeness and the burial of food and valuable articles with the dead. N also notes that G precludes any non-symbolic explanation for the popularity of wine and phallus among the artistic representations. N feels that G's sweeping generalities occasionally invite adverse comment. Despite G's vast technical knowledge, further precision is desired in some cases. N concludes, "Scholars will forever remain indebted to Dr. Goodenough." M. Hadas in *Commentary* 24 (1, '57) 81-82 notes that G has not drawn definite conclusions. H encounters difficulty believing that the mystic ideas maintained a central place in Judaism for any length of time. G's work "has added a new dimension to our understanding of religious development."

210r. S. ZEITLIN in *JewQuartRev* 45 (1, '54) 66-73 reviewing only the first volume, remarks, "I do not deny the importance of symbols but they are only auxiliaries." J. Gildea in *HomPastRev* 57 (9, '57) 868-870 highly recommends this work for professors and students specializing in this field. F. Landsberger in *AmJournPhil* 76 (4, '55) 422-425 objects to G's theory of two opposed trends in Judaism. L speaks of "only one Judaism of which Rabbinic, however, was not the complete expression." L considers G's work "an invaluable . . . contribution to the knowledge of Jewish art." S. W. Baron in *JournBibLit* 74 (3, '55) 196-199 states that the immense amount of evidence and the guideposts established for its interpretation make G's work "a major contribution to learning." R. A. F. MacKenzie in *CathBibQuart* 16 (4, '54) 489-491 remarks that all students of Judaism owe a great debt to G for collecting and publishing his material. Botterweck in *TheolQuart* 137 (2, '57) 210-211 encourages full recognition and offers sincere thanks to G for so scholarly a publication. M. Smith in *AnglTheolRev* 39 (3, '57) 261-264 summarizes his opinion of G's work as important for the history of Judaism and valuable to students of religion. D. E. L. in *Irenikon* 28 (3, '55) 333-334 emphasizes G's erudition, documentation, and objective commentary. G restores to us a Judaism of great religious wealth.

BOOK:

211r. H. J. SCHOEPS, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen: J. Mohr, 1956, DM 9.80), iv and 88 pp.

In this brochure S discusses problems raised by criticisms of his earlier works, notably *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949), and adds a section on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

OPINION:

212r. For W. D. DAVIES in *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 66-70 S has presented the role of Jewish Christianity in the earlier Church with more restraint than in his earlier work, though he still overemphasizes the antagonism between Jewish Christians and Paul. With M. Smith in *AnglTheolRev* 39 (2, '57) 179-181 Davies calls attention to S's insistence that neither was Paul right and his opponents wrong, nor can it be said that Paul understood Jesus better than did the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem (p. 23). He has high praise for S's lucid discussion of Gnosis, but does not regard as conclusive S's arguments for deriving Judaism and Christianity from "heterodox" Judaism and not from Gnosticism. Smith finds "most plausible" Schoeps's account of the relation of later Judaeo-Christianity to the primitive Jewish community, but terms "doubtful" the sharp separation of Gnosticism from "heterodox" Judaism. He describes the book as a "brilliant synthesis," though "sometimes fantastically so." Both reviewers recommend this book to the serious student and, along with J. Levie in *NouvRevThéol* 79 (5, '57) 538, agree that S has greatly clarified ideas of his earlier works. Cf. also D. Lanne in *Irénikon* 29 ('56) 450.

BOOK:

213r. D. DAUBE, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: The Athlone Press, 1956, 45 s.; New York: John deGraff, 1956, \$9.00), 460 pp.

A revised and expanded form of the Louis H. Jordan lectures (1952), this book establishes the rabbinic influence on certain passages of the NT, in which the Jewish flavor has been unnoticed or attributed to Hellenistic influence. The division is threefold. (1) Messianic Types: Ruth is seen as a type for the Virgin Mary, Moses' birth for Christ's birth, Samuel's infancy for Christ's, etc. (2) Legislative and Narrative Forms: a parallel is shown between the literary form of rabbinic writings and the NT. (3) Concepts and Conventions.

OPINION:

214r. Of the various reviewers, J. WOOD in *ExpTimes* 67 (10, '56) 296 stands alone in giving unreserved praise. The book is "of the highest importance for the Biblical scholar." S. Sandmel in *JournBibLit* 76 (1, '57) 64-65 also commends the work highly, but regrets to find "all too little reflection of the circumstance that the gospel materials were shaped by the developing Church." M. Boismard in *RevBib* 64 (2, '57) 299-300, though in disagreement with some of D's interpretations, considers the book a "remarkable contribution to the study of the NT and Judaism." D. Frangipane in *VerbDom* 35 (2, '57) 118-120 admits D's familiarity with the NT and rabbinic literature but criticizes him as biased in favor of Judaism and unconcerned about the historicity of the Gospels. Some of the Messianic types proposed are novel, but hardly acceptable to a Catholic exegete. The comparisons in Section II are useful, but present a likeness that can be merely external. E. O'Doherty in *TheolStud* 17 (3, '56) 419 welcomes the "tremendous amount of material quoted from the rabbis of the early Christian centuries," but agrees with Z. Werblowsky in *JournJewStud*

7 (3-4, '56) 234-236 that the worth of the book is limited. The Judaism to which the NT is compared in many cases is not contemporary with it. In other cases, the conclusions drawn from the comparison rest on very slender evidence.

BOOK:

215r. C. K. BARRETT, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956, 21s, \$3.50), xxiv and 276 pp.

Many documents concerning the NT background are not easily accessible to all. B has compiled over two hundred documents in translation dealing with the most important aspects of the civilization into which Christianity came. Under twelve headings B designs a vivid backdrop for early Christianity and the NT. An appendix contains the Zadokite Documents and some of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

OPINION:

216r. P. SIMPSON in *Studies* 45 (181, '57) 132 regrets that B did not compile more documents but concludes, "We have every reason to be grateful for what we have." S and the reviewer for *ExpTimes* 68 (6, '57) 161-162 agree that B has given teachers and students of the NT a work of inestimable value. J. L. M. in *AnglTheolRev* 39 (3, '57) 281-282 and V. Corwin in *ChristCent* 74 (July 17, '57) 869, however, dispute the value of the book, alleging that insufficient instruction in methods of citation and evaluation will limit its usefulness for the average student. C also wishes that B had enlarged his appendix on the Dead Sea Scrolls. A. Viard in *RevSciencPhilThéol* 41 (2, '57) 250 feels that more learned expositions have failed to give so clear a picture of NT background, and regards the book as useful both as history and for consultation. The reviewer for *TimesLitSupp* 56 (March 15, '57) 165 objects to the space given the Slavonic Josephus and notes a few misprints and errors. Still, he concludes, "A second edition . . . must surely be called for; for this is a book that should have a long and useful life."

BOOK:

217r. F. NÖTSCHER, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*, Bonner Bibl. Beiträge, 10 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1956, DM 22.50), 201 pp.

In a careful philological study of published Qumran material, N employs the synthetic method to highlight six major themes—gnosis, dualism, light and darkness, eschatology, eternity, and retribution—and he relates them in so far as possible to Gnosticism, Mandeism, Iranism, the apocrypha, the OT and the NT.

OPINION:

218r. With other reviewers, R. MURPHY in *CathBibQuart* 19 (1, '57) 134-136 commends this study which, though tentative in its conclusions, is justified by the amount of Qumran material available; he would have preferred an analytical treatment, but with V. Hamp in *BibZeit* 1 (1, '57) 157-158, Botterweck in

TheolQuart 137 (2, '57) 249, L. Rost in *TheolLitZeit* 82 (4, '57) 267, and M. Rehm in *MünchTheolZeit* 8 (1, '57) 65, Murphy praises N's rich knowledge and scholarly reserve in formulating conclusions. Rehm concurs with F. Bruce who in *JournSemStud* 2 (2, '57) 207-209 characterizes this as a "valuable handbook for Biblical study in general." J. Coppens notes in *EphTheolLov* 32 ('56) 379-380 that it will be a precious aid to students of the NT who read neither Hebrew nor Aramaic.

219r. COPPENS, Rehm, and Hamp as well as H. Gross in *TrierTheolZeit* 65 (4, '56) 251-252 give particular attention to N's conclusions that Gnosis and dualism in Qumran thought involve an ethical and religious rather than a speculative and cosmic outlook such as is found in systems other than OT and NT. Bruce, however, feels that N has undervalued non-Jewish contributions to Judaism of the Second Commonwealth, and that he has given insufficient weight to evidence suggesting a Qumran belief that the last days have already begun. Coppens would desire more information on the presence of the Spirit in the midst of the Community.

All of the reviewers agree that N's cautious and conservative treatment is signalized by broad scholarship and control of texts which link Qumran with other religious ideas. Hence the book constitutes a basic tool for further study of Qumran theology.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Cristo nel mondo. IV.* (Assisi: Pro Civitate Christiana. A cura dell' Osservatorio Cristiano, 900 Lire), 382 pp.

Winning Converts: A Symposium on Methods of Convert Making for Priests and Lay People, ed. Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph.D. (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Books, 1957, 35¢), vi & 250 pp.

CORRECTION: In vol. 1, p. 237 line 9 should read: "CERFAUX—Monsignor Lucien Cerfaux was born in Presles, . . ."

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

AUDET—Jean-Paul Audet, O.P., was born in Saint-Anselme, in the Province of Quebec, Canada, on December 7, 1918. He studied at the Dominican Theological College in Ottawa (S.T.L.), and at the Angelicum in Rome (S.T.D.). Later at the Griffith Institute of Oxford and at the École Biblique in Jerusalem, he was engaged in research on early Christian and Qumran literature. At present he is Professor of New Testament Theology at the Dominican Theological College in Ottawa (since 1952), and Professor of Comparative Theology at the Institute of Mediaeval Studies of the University of Montreal (since 1956). His publications since 1950 have been devoted to early Christian literature and background studies. Destined for publication by Gabalda (Paris) this year is his latest work, *La Didachè. Instructions des Apôtres*, in the *Études Bibliques* series.

FILSON—Floyd Vivian Filson, Presbyterian minister, was born in Hamilton, Missouri, on November 15, 1896. A graduate of McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, he has since 1922 held there various teaching and administrative positions. At present he is its Dean and acting Vice-President as well as Professor of New Testament Literature. He has been President of the following learned societies: the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis (1949), the Chicago Society of Biblical Research (1946), and the National Association of Biblical Instructors (1944). His numerous writings since 1931 have concerned Gospel origins and primitive Christianity. He has recently published translations of Cullmann's *Christ and Time*, and *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, and Martyr*. His latest work is *Which Books Belong in the Bible?*

JEREMIAS—Joachim Jeremias, D.D., Th.D., Lutheran theologian, was born in Dresden, Germany, on September 20, 1900. He studied at the University of Leipzig (Th.L., Ph.D.), and from 1929 to 1935 was Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Greifswald. In 1935 he took the same position at the University of Göttingen and has held it until the present. In 1955 he was President of *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, and at present is a member of the *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* and Chairman of its Septuagint Commission. Though writing principally in German, he has published several of his books in French, Swedish, and English translations. He has specialized in research on Rabbinica and on Palestine and Jerusalem at the time of Christ, and has written widely in these fields since 1923. In 1956 he published *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker* (French translation, *Jésus et les païens*). His English translation, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, will be published soon in London, as well as his *The Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, originally published in German in 1951. Other recent works include: *The Servant of God* (with W. Zimmerli, 1957), *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (2nd German edition 1949, Engl. trans., 1955), and, appearing soon, *Geschichte der Kindertaufe in den Ersten vier Jahrhunderten*.

KNOX—John Knox, Methodist minister, was born in Frankfort, Kentucky, on December 30, 1900. A Ph.D. (University of Chicago) and an honorary Litt.D. (Randolph-Macon College), he has taught at Emory University, Hartford Theological Seminary, and the University of Chicago. Since 1943 he has been at Union Theological Seminary, New York, where he is Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature and Director of Studies. At one time Managing Editor of *Christendom* and Editor of the *Journal of Religion*, he is at present Associate Editor of the *Interpreter's Bible*. Since 1932, his works have generally concerned the person of Christ and of St. Paul. More recent books include: *On the Meaning of Christ* (1947), *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (1950), and *Criticism and Faith* (1952).

SANDMEL—Rabbi Samuel Sandmel was born in Dayton, Ohio, on September 23, 1911. After studies at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati (B.H., 1937), Duke University, and Yale (Ph.D., 1949), he occupied the Hillel Chair of Jewish Literature and Thought at Vanderbilt University for three years until 1952. In 1951, under the President's Fellowship of Brown University, he published *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*. At present he is Professor of the Bible and Hellenic Literature at Hebrew Union College and at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, and is Chairman of the Executive Committee and Provost of these institutions. *Philo's Place in Judaism* was published in 1954, and scheduled to appear early in 1958 is *The Genius of Paul*.

SAYDON—Monsignor Peter Paul Saydon, Lit.B., D.D., S.S.L., was born in Malta on July 24, 1895. He studied at the Royal University of Malta (D.D.), and at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome (S.S.L.). He has been since 1931 Professor of Holy Scripture, Hebrew, and Biblical Greek at the Royal University. A specialist in Semitic philology, Arabic versions of the Bible, and Old Testament literary criticism, he has published much on Old Testament subjects. Besides being the author of several of the commentaries on Old Testament books in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953), he has written frequent articles for European and American periodicals. To be published next year is *The Bible in Maltese*, the fruit of nearly thirty years of scholarly effort. This will be the first Maltese translation of the entire Bible from the original languages. Articles on Maltese versions are now being prepared for *The Bible Translator* and *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*.

SCHNACKENBURG—Professor Doctor Rudolf Schnackenburg was born on January 5, 1914, at Kattowitz in Silesia (formerly in Prussia, now in Poland). He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Breslau, where he earned the S.T.D. in 1937. Ordained a Catholic priest, he devoted the succeeding years to the ministry until he was exiled from Silesia in 1946. He then went to Munich where he lectured at the University while engaged in the study of Pauline Theology. He was made Professor of New Testament at the Philosophisch-theologische Hochschule in Dillingen (Bavaria) in 1951, and then in Bamberg in 1955. He has recently been appointed Professor of New Testa-

ment in the University of Würtzburg. He has specialized in the field of New Testament Theology, and has contributed widely to periodicals and lexica. His more outstanding books include: *Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus* (1950), *Das Erste Wunder Jesu* (1951), *Die Johannesbriefe* (1953), (which is the first volume of the large German commentary being edited by A. Wikenhauser), and *Die Sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testaments* (1954). He is a co-editor of the newly-reestablished *Biblische Zeitschrift* (Paderborn).

SHEPHERD—Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., Ph.D., S.T.D., Episcopalian minister, was born in Wilmington, North Carolina, on March 14, 1913. He studied at the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1937), and at the Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, (B.D., 1941; S.T.D., 1951). He was Professor of Liturgics at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts (1940-54), and at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific (1954-). Since 1951 he has been Director of the summer division of the Graduate School of Theology at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. Prominent in the field of liturgical origins, he has published *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary* (1950) and *The Worship of the Church* (1952).

STIER—Fridolin Stier was born in Karssee, Southwestern Germany, on January 20, 1902. He studied philosophy, theology, Oriental languages, and the history of religions at the Eberhard-Karls University, Tübingen. After his ordination to the priesthood he was engaged in pastoral work for some years, then continued his biblical and Oriental studies at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome. Since 1933, after receiving the S.T.D., he has been Professor of Old Testament and the History of Oriental Thought at Eberhard-Karls University, Tübingen. In 1951 he inaugurated the *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*, of which he is the editor. He also has published *Gott und sein Engel im Alten Testament*, as well as *Quellenkritik des äthiopischen Buches Henoch*, and *Das Buch Ijob*, a translation and commentary. In preparation are a lengthy commentary on Jeremiah and a work on the ethical message of the Old Testament.

VOGT—Ernest Vogt, S.J., Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, was born in Basel, Switzerland, on January 30, 1903. He studied at the University of Innsbruck, and he has taught in Brazil at the Seminario Provincial N.S. da Conceição in São Leopoldo, at the Gymnasio Catharinense in Florianópolis, at the Colégio Cristo Rei, and at the Seminário Central in São Leopoldo. In 1948 he returned to the Pontifical Biblical Institute as Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Textual Criticism. The following year he was made Rector, and continued as Professor of Old Testament Exegesis. In 1952 he became editor of *Biblica*. He has written numerous articles in Latin, Italian, Portuguese, and English on the Old and New Testament, mostly in *Biblica*. A recent article, "Peace among Men of God's Good Pleasure," is included in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (1957), edited by K. Stendahl.

BOOK NOTICES

J. Daniélou, *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les Origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Éditions de l'Orante, 1957, 390 fr.), 125 pp., 8 photos.

In this text of three lectures, Fr. Daniélou discusses briefly and precisely Qumran parallels in the Gospels, the Teacher of Righteousness and alleged comparisons with Christ, and Essene influence in the development of the early Church.

X. Léon-Dufour, *Concordance to the Synoptic Gospels*, trans. R. J. O'Connell (New York: Desclée, 1957, \$2.00), 21 pp. and 3 folders.

The English translation of Fr. Léon-Dufour's brief but rich color-chart concordance incorporates a number of changes made with the author's approval.

J. T. Milik, *Dix Ans de Découvertes dans le Désert de Juda*, preface by R. de Vaux, O.P. (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1957, 600 fr.), 121 pp., 3 maps, 35 photographs.

The work of an authority of highest rank, this semi-popular survey contains a description of the Scrolls and fragments and their history, a reconstruction of the history of the Sect showing the results of recent scholarship, and an evaluation of the Dead Sea materials. Appendices include a chronological table of Maccabean and Roman times, an essay on the history of the Essenes, and a bibliography, chiefly of the texts thus far published.

Biblische Zeitschrift, New Series Volume I, Heft 1 and 2, 1957 (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, DM 15 per issue, appearing in January and July); vol. I, 318 pp.

Under the editorship of Dr. V. Hamp and Dr. R. Schnackenburg, the *Biblische Zeitschrift* has made a welcome reappearance after 17 years' silence. The two issues of vol. I contain ten articles and ten shorter contributions on OT and NT subjects, with reports on three biblical conventions and numerous book reviews. Abstracts of the NT material will appear in *NTA* vol. 2, no. 2 (Winter 1958).

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete. International Review of Biblical Studies. Volume IV, Heft 1-2, 1955-56 (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1957, DM 38. \$9.10), xii & 272 pp.

Of volume III H. H. Rowley says (*ExpTimes* 68 [12, '57] 382): "Altogether no less than 1495 items are listed, covering the years 1954-55. . . . A large international team of scholars is engaged in the preparation of the abstracts, and all students of the Bible are put under a heavy debt to them for an indispensable tool. Every good theological library should have it, and scholars working in other fields must envy the student of the Old and New Testaments in having such a valuable survey at his disposal." The present volume IV brings the literature up through 1956 and contains 1680 items.

